

The Classical Review

MAY, 1939

NOTES AND NEWS

THE publication of the *Classical Review* and the *Classical Quarterly* will shortly be taken over by the Oxford University Press. All communications intended for the publisher concerning the September or later numbers of the *Classical Review* should therefore be sent to the Secretary to the Delegates, Clarendon Press, Oxford. Books for review should be sent to the Editors of the *Classical Review*, c/o the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

The Chairman of the Classical Journals Board writes:

'The Board deeply regret the end, due solely to the difficulty of continuing the journals in face of increased costs of production, of their long and happy connection with the firm of John Murray. The Delegates of the Oxford University Press have generously undertaken obligations which no private firm could be asked to assume.'

The summaries of *Gnomon*, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, and *Classical Weekly* which have hitherto been published in *C.R.* have been discontinued. In place of them it is intended to publish in *C.R.* summaries of other journals which have hitherto been dealt with in *C.Q.*

From a correspondent:

'The Classical Association held its Annual General Meeting from April 12th to 15th at the Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green. The Principal (Miss J. R. Bacon), in the witty prologue with which she introduced her production of the *Mostellaria*, lamented that the neighbourhood could provide neither civic receptions nor Roman remains. But the beauty of the college grounds and Miss Bacon's gracious hospitality were more than adequate compensation. It is indeed difficult to recall a meeting which was so pleasant and varied on the social side. The

members were welcomed on the first evening by Miss Bacon and the Vice-Provost of Eton College (Mr. C. H. K. Marten), a Governor of the Royal Holloway College. On the second evening students of the college performed the *Mostellaria* in a spirited verse translation by Miss Bacon. The Annual Dinner was held on the last evening. One afternoon was devoted to a visit to Windsor and Eton.

'The strictly classical activities were no less varied. Dr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge delivered his Presidential Address on "The Value of some Ancient Greek Scientific Ideas". Dr. J. W. Mackail in moving a vote of thanks to the President spoke of the foundation of the Association thirty-five years ago. The sections relating to Classics in the "Spens" Report were the subject of an interesting discussion opened by Miss A. Woodward. The papers covered a wide range of topics. Miss Bacon, speaking on "Aeneas in Wonderland, A Study of *Aeneid VIII*", showed that this book marks the turning-point of the hero's career. The fitful light which flashes in the earlier books gives place to serene radiance, and Aeneas goes forward confidently to his goal. Dr. N. Bachtin in a paper on "Linguistics and Classical Studies" maintained that the linguistic approach was still the essential one for the study of classical thought and culture. Rigid and unimaginative teaching of grammar had reduced Greek and Latin to 'dead' languages, but the substitution of a vague knowledge of ancient civilization was not the true remedy, which must be sought instead in the appreciation of language as a living growth. Greek and Latin could be brought to life again through study of their modern descendants. Professor J. H. Sleeman, dealing with "Mysticism in Plotinus", traced its origins in earlier Greek thought and stressed the importance of the influence of Plotinus upon St. Augustine. Mr. J. Cowser's interesting paper

on "The Shaping of the *Antigone*" contained cogent arguments for the dramatic necessity of the double burial, which has given rise to so many curious and unconvincing theories. He insisted that *Antigone* was responsible for the first burial, and gave an illuminating exposition of the structure of the first half of the play. Miss M. B. Ferguson read a witty and charming paper entitled "*Quo sensu credis et ore?*" A Study of Facial Expression in Greek and Latin Literature", commenting on the paucity of Greek terms for facial expression and the detailed attention given by Roman writers on oratory to the importance of expression and gesture. Finally Professor B. Farrington, on "Epicurus and the *Laws of Plato*", discussed the relation of the teaching of Epicurus to Plato's political doctrines. He described Plato's ideal government as a régime of fear, for which Epicurus wished to substitute the reign of friendship. Epicurus was not attacking popular superstition, but a religious system advocated by Plato for the maintenance of governmental supremacy. That Dr. C. Bailey was acting as Chairman and able to take up his challenge at once added to the interest of a provocative and important paper.

'At the Business Meeting Sir Stephen Gaselee was elected President for 1939.

'The meeting was very well attended. In recent years when the Association has met out of London it has become usual to seek accommodation in a College or University Hall of Residence, so that there is greater opportunity for informal discussion with the company gathered under one roof. The number residing in the College on this occasion was larger than in any previous year in similar circumstances.

'The Association owes a heavy debt of gratitude to the Governors and Principal of the Royal Holloway College for making possible a highly successful meeting in most attractive surroundings.'

The performance of the *Antigone* in March seems to have divided opinions more than most of the Cambridge productions of Greek plays, and two critics whom the editors of *C.R.* approached are diffident. That the speak-

ing was good, they agree; but to one the acting of the principal characters was moving, to the other it was unpretentious but sound. To one the music was exquisite: to the other it seemed to bear no relation to the words or tone of the choruses, 'and where most needed, in the laments of *Antigone* and *Creon*, it was dumb'. 'The scenery, costumes, and lighting were adequate': 'the dresses belonged to a not unpleasant Oriental Ruritania which had had some slight contact with sixth-century Greece'. 'The Chorus in a Greek play', says one, 'must not be side-stepped or relegated; it must be made a *feature*, if not *the feature*. And, again, every element in a Greek play must be co-ordinated: the *régisseur* must rouse in or impart to his cast a collective, communal, soul'.—An exacting play, there or here, then or now.

L'Année philologique is always welcome, early or late; and Tome XII is early. For details see below (p. 95). It is a digest of things published in 1937. Eight pages longer than XI, it has all the merits of previous volumes, and perhaps yet greater accuracy than they: even 'Nichomachean' and *παῖδια* are faithfully reproduced from *C.Q.* 1937, pp. 129 and 158. Besides such misprints as *Aeschinus* and *Χαλλιμάχου*, which can do no harm, let us mention a few mistakes which may lead to waste of time: 'Boerck' is a misnomer for Björck, 'Fraenkel' for Fränkel, 'K. E.' Fritsch for C.-E., 'Ch.' Stanley for C. (Carleton); and Page's article on a fragment of Greek tragedy (p. 44) belongs to *C.Q.*, not *C.W.* Of relevant references to *C.R.* LI we have missed, so far, only one: to a review of a book by Baggally. —Year after year this excellent annual does great credit to its director, M. Marouzeau, and to its present rédactrice, Mlle Juliette Ernst.

Dioniso continues to be fresh and various. Since the last notice of it in *C.R.* (LI. 113) we have had five numbers of Vol. VI and the first of VII. Archaeology is well served by a series of articles on the theatres of Ancona, Teramo, Gubbio, and in Piedmont. P. E. Arias discusses the relations of

Greek tragedy, C. Drago those of the satyric drama, with architecture and the plastic arts. A. Olivieri restores the new fragment of the *Δικτυουλοί*, and there are articles on Timocles *ὁ κωμικός* (V. Bevilacqua), on the *πολυκέφαλος νόμος* (O. Gamba), and on mythographical information to be gathered from the Arguments to certain plays (D. Bassi). A. Todesco and N. Terzaghi discuss Euripides' prologues: the former protests that they are not dramatically inert, the latter looks for the origin of prologue and epilogue in the discrepancy between myth and scepticism. I. Caimo examines the *Medea* at some length, pointing out that the *Medea* of legend is made into a purely human figure. N. Festa writes on the *Epitrepontes*, and V. de Falco on Menander's *σεμνότης*. The history of drama is dealt with in papers on the theatre during the Empire (R. Paribeni), revivals of the Chorus in post-classical drama (A. Jácono), Homeric and classical survivals in popular modern Greek dances (M. Montesanto). There are also articles by G. L. Luzzatto on neo-classical translations and imitations of Sophocles; reports of recent perform-

ances of classical plays; reviews; and a wealth of illustrations.

The seventh volume of *Hesperia*, now complete, consists, as usual, of two parts devoted to the excavations in the Agora, and two which chronicle other activities of the American School at Athens. Apart from the account of the 1937 campaign, the Agora reports are mainly concerned with inscriptions and pottery. The other numbers chronicle small excavations in Corinth, the Argolid, and Athens, and one of more importance on the north slope of the Acropolis which continues work done in 1930-1933. This produced some inscriptions, a fine sixth-century bronze statuette, a quantity of pottery, and a curious hoard of 191 *ostraka*, apparently for the ostracism of 482 B.C. Two thirds are written on the round bases of cups, fourteen different writers seem to have been employed, and every sherd but one (which bears the name of Kimon) is a vote for Themistokles. The *ostraka* cannot have been used, and somebody (vote-shop or party-office) would seem to have overestimated that statesman's unpopularity.

SEATS IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN THEATRES.

THERE are several passages in ancient authors¹ which, taken together, seem to imply that the spectators of Roman drama during its productive period were forced to stand. This view was readily accepted by nineteenth-century scholars, eager to find as many differences as possible between Greek and Roman practice; it is, of course, incompatible with the frequent references to a seated audience in the prologues of Plautus' plays;² such references were therefore regarded as proof that the prologues themselves were post-Plautine.³ We may, indeed, agree that a prologue is the part of a play which is most liable to modification at the hands of later producers;⁴ and with the pro-

logues we might be willing also to sacrifice the concluding words of the *Truculentus*:

spectatores, bene ualete, plaudite atque exsurgite.

There are other references to seats, however, within the body of the plays (*Aul.* 719, *Curc.* 644-7, *Poen.* 1224); and these passages set us a pretty dilemma: are we to regard them as examples of somewhat mechanical translation from the Greek, or as post-Plautine insertions?

The supposed evidence against the existence of seats seems to imply further that the spectators were forced to stand not merely from lack of accommodation but because of decrees designed to check luxury and idleness.⁵ Such legislation must have been singularly un-

¹ Given in P.-W., s.v. *theatrum*.

² *Amph.* 65; *Capl.* 12; *Poen.* 10; *Pseud.* 1.

³ This view is still upheld e.g. by Wight Duff, *Literary History of Rome*, 1927, p. 157.

⁴ Cf. the prologue to the *Casina*, which refers expressly to a revival performance.

⁵ Cf. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 20: *stantem populum spectauisse, ne, si consideret theatro, dies totos ignauia continuaret.*

popular with the theatre-goers who had to remain on their feet throughout long plays, the actors and playwrights who were handicapped by the discomfort thus inflicted on their public, and even the magistrates who gave the shows in order to win the favour of the electorate. Everyone present would, of course, be aware that in Greek theatres no further away than Pompeii seating accommodation was provided for all. In *Poen.* 1224 a character remarks 'in pauca confer: sitiunt qui sedent', 'Cut it short: the stalls are thirsty'. Is this, perhaps, an example of mechanical translation from the Greek? But how irritated would a *standing* audience be at such a reference to the (comparatively trifling) discomforts of a *seated* audience! How tactless the dramatist who would allow such a reference to remain! This line must, therefore, be a post-Plautine insertion (in spite of its Plautine ring); we may admit that jokes of this kind might well be added by an interpolator. But it is not so easy to explain away *Aul.* 718-9:

quid est? quid ridetis? noui omnes, scio fures
esse hic complures,
qui uestitu et creta occultant sese atque sedent
quasi sint frugi.

'Eh, what's that? What are you grinning for? I know you, the whole lot of you! I know there are thieves here, plenty of 'em, that cover themselves up in dapper clothes and sit still as if they were honest men!'¹

Here Euclio, robbed of his gold, is addressing the audience—and he refers to them as seated. Jestful references to the knavishness of the audience may, of course, be paralleled in Greek (e.g. *Ran.* 274-6), and it would be natural to assume that Plautus is here translating his original; but we cannot suppose that the lines quoted were addressed to a *standing* audience; they cannot, therefore, be an example of mechanical translation from the Greek,² but must *ex hypothesi* be another post-Plautine insertion. But I now wish to draw attention to a remarkable passage in the *Curculio* (643-7):

¹ Nixon's translation.

² Especially in view of the apparent reference to togas, *togae cretatae*,—which, by the way, seem to have been worn as early as the fifth century (Livy IV. xxv. 13).

THE. nutrix quae fuit? PLAN. Arcestrata.
ea me spectatum tulerat per Dionysia.
postquam illo uentum est, iam, ut me conlo-
cauerat,
exoritur uentus turbo, spectacula ibi ruunt,
ego pertimesco. ibi me nescio quis arripit...

These lines occur in the vital *ἀναγνώ-
σις* or 'recognition' scene. The heroine is explaining how she was kidnapped in her infancy. Her nurse had taken her to the show at the Dionysiac festival. 'We had scarcely arrived, and I been put in my place, when a perfect hurricane arose; the seats caved in—I was so terrified! Then someone or other seized me...' (Nixon's translation.) So far as I know, the authenticity of these lines has not been questioned; in fact, they form an appropriate and almost essential part of an essential scene. There can be no reason, therefore, for doubting that they are from the hand of Plautus himself. From this it would seem to follow that even in Plautus' times the word *spectac(u)la* had acquired the sense 'seats for spectators' in which we find it regularly used in Classical and Silver Latin.³ Moreover, as the scene described is Greek in detail, and as the passage would have been as essential to the Greek original as to the Latin translation, it would seem to follow that Plautus is here translating from the Greek.

The scene of the *Curculio* is in Epidaurus (line 341); the kidnapping of the heroine, however, must have occurred somewhere else.⁴ Of the Greek original of the *Curculio* we know nothing; but as Athens was the birthplace and focus of New Comedy,⁵ it is natural to suppose that this play also was written and first produced at Athens, and further that the heroine should herself be regarded as Athenian by birth (like Palaestra in the *Rudens*). The kidnapping would, therefore, have occurred during the festival of Dionysus in Athens. I know of no evidence that

³ Cic. *Pro Sest.* 124; Livy I. xxxv 8; Ovid *Met.* x 668; Tac. *Ann.* xiv 13; Suet. *Calig.* 35, *Dom.* 10.

⁴ Kidnapped children are always taken to another town: see *Captivi*, *Menaechmi*, *Poenulus*, *Rudens*.

⁵ Half of Plautus' plays are staged at Athens.

special seats were erected for the spectators of the processions on such occasions; the natural assumption is that the kidnapping occurred in the theatre.¹ Apparently, then, we are to understand that the spectators' seats in the Athenian theatre collapsed in a storm. That this incident had actually occurred, and within the memory of the spectators who first saw the original of the *Curculio*, is suggested by Therapontigonus' remark (line 651): 'memini istanc turbam fieri'.

To justify this conclusion, I must now endeavour to show (1) that the word *spectacula* in the passage quoted can only mean 'spectators' seats'; (2) that, even in the time of New Comedy, there were still, in the Athenian theatre, seats capable of being blown down by a storm—in other words, wooden seats supported on scaffolding.

Two passages in Suetonius show clearly that *spectacula* can be used of the part of an amphitheatre occupied by the spectators (*Cal.* 35: 'hunc spectaculis detractum repente et in harenam deductum Thraeci comparavit'; *Dom.* 10: 'patrem familias quod Thraecem murmilloni parem, munerario imparem dixerat, detractum spectaculis in harenam canibus obiecit'). The reference here would presumably be to the tiers of stone seats; but that *spectacula* can also mean 'grand stands' is indicated by Tac. *Ann.* XIV. 13: 'exstructos, qua incederet, spectaculorum gradus, quo modo triumphi uisuntur'; and that the 'gods' in the amphitheatre occupied such wooden stands is suggested by Suet. *Aug.* 44, where we are told that, to allay a panic, the emperor left his place and sat in that part of the building which seemed threatened with collapse.³ That the occupants of the *spectacula* normally

sat even in the time of Cicero is shown by *Pro Sest.* 124: 'maximum uero populi Romani iudicium uniuersi consensu gladiatorio declaratum est . . . in hunc consessum P. Sestius . . . uenit . . . tantus est ex omnibus spectaculis . . . plausus excitatus . . .' Finally we have a description in Livy of the 'grand stands' of the primitive Circus (I. xxxv 8): 'tum primum circo, qui nunc maximus dicitur, designatus locus est. loca diuisa patribus equitibusque ubi spectacula sibi quisque facerent; fori appellati; spectauere furcis duodenos ab terra spectacula alta sustinentibus pedes'. Evidently the Fathers stood—or (perhaps more probably) sat—on platforms twelve feet high, which were supported by forked poles.

Not only can *spectacula* mean 'seats at a show': it is the only precise word for such seats (though we find *subsellia*, *scamna*, *sedilia*, used for the 'seats', 'benches', or 'rows'). The primary meaning of the word is 'show', 'spectacle'; its only other sense is 'seats' (or 'stands') for the spectators of a show; nowhere does it mean 'stage scenery'. In the *Curculio* passage it cannot bear its primary meaning: how could the 'show' be blown down by the wind? Evidently something collapsed and thereby spread panic among the spectators; what could this have been unless the seats or scaffolding on which they sat or stood? We should also consider the words 'ut me conlocauerat', which surely describe how the nurse set the little girl on a seat. The only reason for resisting this argument is that we seem to have proved too much; in trying to show that the Roman spectators sat on wooden seats, we seem to have shown that the Greek spectators sat on wooden seats too.

We are so accustomed to picture the audience of Sophocles sitting on rows of stone seats that we find it hard to realize that the evidence is against such a view. Even Haigh, after proving to his own satisfaction (*Attic Theatre*, pp. 83-6) that the seats in the theatre of Dionysus were not of stone but of wood until long after the end of the fifth century, is apt to forget his conclusions and slip back to the earlier view. I doubt the relevance of the

¹ The vexed question whether women were admitted to the Athenian theatre would seem to be settled, for the late fourth century at least, by this very passage.

² The *pater familias* would presumably be sitting (within earshot of the emperor) in one of the rows of stone seats which formed the lower two *maeniana* of the Flavian Amphitheatre.

³ cum consternatum ruinae metu populum retinere . . . nullo modo posset, transiit e loco suo atque in ea parte cecidit quae suspecta maxime erat.

archaeological evidence; while Puchstein tries to date the stone seats as far back as the last years of the fifth century, Dörpfeld, supported by Haigh, assigns them to a date not earlier than the middle of the fourth century; and Haigh suggests that they owe their origin to the reconstruction of Lycurgus, who was minister of finance between 338 and 326. The inscriptions on the seats seem to belong to the age of Hadrian. I turn to the literary evidence.

The only word I can find in fifth-century Greek for 'seats in the theatre' is *ικρία* (*ikria*).¹ The general sense of this word appears to be 'planking resting on uprights'; thus in Homer it denotes 'decks'; in Herodotus v. 16 it is used of the platforms of lake-dwellers (*ικρία ἐπὶ σταυρῶν ὑψηλῶν ἐξευγμένα ἐν μέσῃ ἔστηκε τῇ λίμνῃ*). Sometimes in mediaeval authors it seems to be used of upright poles; nowhere have I found it used to denote an object made of any material other than wood. Of its use for 'seats in the theatre' we have two fifth-century examples:

Ar. *Thesm.* 395 :

ὥστ' εὐθὺς εἰσιόντες ἀπὸ τῶν *ικρίων*
ὑποβλέποντες ἡμᾶς

(of the men coming home to their wives from the theatre);

Cratin. *Incert.* 53 (Meineke) :

χαῖρ', ὦ μέγ' ἀχρεῖως δμλεταὶς ἐπίβδαις,
τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας κριτῆς ἀριστε πάντων·
εὐδαίμων' ἔτι κτε σε μήτηρ *ικρίων* ψόφῃσιν

(where the poet is addressing the Athenian audience, who delight in the 'clatter of the benches', *spectaculorum strepitu*, as Meineke translates it).

I have found no other word in Greek drama for 'spectators' seats' (as opposed to the 'seats of honour' of the *πρόεδροι*).

For further information about these theatrical *ικρία* we must turn with due caution to the mediaeval lexicographers:

Photius (ninth cent.), s.v. *ικρία* : τὰ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀφ' ὧν ἐθεώοντο τοὺς Διονυσιακοὺς ἀγῶνας πρὶν ἢ κατασκευασθῆναι τὸ ἐν Διονύσου θέατρον.

Suidas (c. 1100 A.D. ?), s.v. *ικρία* :

¹ πρῶτον ξύλον seems to be used only of the front bench at the Pnyx or in the courthouse.

ὀρθὰ ξύλα . . . καὶ τὰ τῶν θεάτρων . . . ἐπὶ ξύλων γὰρ ἐκάθηντο. πρὶν γένηται τὸ θέατρον, ξύλα ἐδέσμευον καὶ οὕτως ἐθεώρουν. Ἀριστοφάνης Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις κ.τ.λ. (as already quoted).

Id. s.v. *Αἰσχύλος* : . . . φηγὼν δὲ εἰς Σικελίαν διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν τὰ *ικρία* ἐπιδεικνυμένου αὐτοῦ . . .

Id. s.v. *Πρατίνος* : . . . ἀντηγωνίζετο δὲ *Αἰσχύλῳ* . . . ἐπὶ τῆς ὀλυμπιάδος . . . ἐπιδεικνυμένου δὲ τούτου συνέβη τὰ *ικρία*, ἐφ' ὧν ἐστήκεισαν οἱ θεαταί, πεσεῖν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου θέατρον ὠκοδομήθη Ἀθηναίοις.

Gramm. Bekker. *Anecd.* p. 354, 25, s.v. *Αἰγείρου θέα* : Ἀθήνησιν αἰγείρος ἦν, ἣς πλησίον τὰ *ικρία* ἐπὶ γίνυντο εἰς τὴν θέαν πρὸ τοῦ θέατρον γενέσθαι. οὕτω Κρατίνος.

Suidas, etc., s.v. *ἀπ' αἰγείρου θέα* : ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων αἰγείρος γὰρ ἐπάνω ἦν τοῦ θεάτρον, ἀφ' ἣς οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες τόπον ἐθεώρουν.

See also Hesychius, s.v.

Haigh's explanation of these conflicting statements is, briefly, that at the beginning of the fifth century the Athenian audience sat on wooden benches rising in tiers one above the other, and resting on wooden supports; that these *ικρία* collapsed during a performance in 499 B.C.; that the Athenians then built, not stone seats, but an earth embankment to support the wooden seats, which were still used: this earth embankment took the place of the "*ikria*" or wooden supports on which the seats had previously rested; that, finally, the stone seats were constructed towards the end of the fourth century. This is a desperate attempt to reconcile the statements of Suidas with Dörpfeld's discovery that 'the earth foundations of the present auditorium . . . consist of two layers. The upper one belongs to the fourth century, as is shown by the fragments of pottery embedded in it; the lower one is proved by similar evidence to be not later than the fifth'. But Haigh's view that the *ικρία* (which he wrongly takes to mean the supports of the seats) were done away with soon after 499 is contradicted by the passages I have quoted from Cratinus and Aristophanes, which speak of *ικρία* as still in use much later. So prominent a feature of the theatre were they in 410 that 'to come from the

ικρία 'is used for 'to come from the theatre'. That they were still made of wood is indicated, I think, by the phrase of Cratinus 'the rattle of the benches'; stone seats would make but little *ψόφησις*. We may compare Pollux's remark s.v. *πετροκοπεῖν*: τὸ μέντοι τὰ ἐδῶλια ταῖς πτέρναις κατακρούειν πτ. ἔλεγον· ἐποίουν δὲ τοῦτο ὅποτε τινὰ ἐκβάλοιεν. Haigh explains: 'The Athenians had also a peculiar custom of marking their disapproval of a performance by kicking with the heels of their sandals against the front of the stone benches on which they were sitting'. Not so peculiar a custom, if the benches were of wood! Haigh has wantonly inserted the word 'stone', against his own theory and against common sense as well.

We notice that Suidas in one place says that the spectators *stood* on the *ικρία* and in another that they *sat* on them. Some of our 'grand stands' at football grounds do not allow the occupants to sit; they merely give elevation. These are, of course, intended for less wealthy folk. Perhaps we should picture the highest and most remote *ικρία* as being of this uncomfortable type. That the general public sat, at least by the time of Aristophanes, is indicated by *Av.* 793-6, where the birds suggest that if one of the spectators should espy in the part of the theatre reserved for members of the *βουλὴ* the husband of the lady with whom he is carrying on an intrigue, a pair of wings would enable the lover to visit his mistress and then resume his seat in the theatre (*αὐθις αὖ καθέζετο*). About the end of the fourth century we find several references to a seated audience: cf. Heges. *Adelph.* 29:

πολλοὶς ἐγὼ σφόδρ' οἶδα τῶν καθημένων.

But the evidence suggests that the audience during the fifth and early fourth century were accommodated on tiers of wooden scaffolding which itself rested on an artificial earth bank; most of them sat, but the less fortunate people on the topmost tiers had to stand; others, again, were perched on trees. If we add to our picture the itinerant vendors of wine and edibles (Philoch. ap. Ath. p. 464E: *παρὰ δὲ*

τὸν ἀγῶνα πάντα οἶνος αὐτοῖς ὄνοχοεῖτο καὶ τραγήματα παρεφέρετο) and the din of the wooden benches, we have a scene reminiscent of Derby Day.

The evidence points to the reconstruction of the theatre as the result of a collapse of the scaffolding. I suggest that this is a correct view, but that the date of this particular accident (there may have been many like it) and of the consequent reconstruction has been placed far too early. The only large-scale reconstruction of which we know was the building of stone seats, perhaps towards the end of the fourth century. The original of the *Curculio* may well have been produced about this time, and the reference to a collapse of seats may have been a reference to a real event.

There is therefore nothing, it would appear, to prevent our supposing that *Curc.* 644-7 was translated by Plautus from his Greek original. If we grant, then, that the word for 'seats at a show' was already established in Latin at that time, it becomes more than ever difficult to resist the conclusion that the plays of Plautus were written for presentation before a seated audience.

It is now becoming recognized that the *external* evidence against seats in the time of Plautus is weaker than was supposed, and the whole argument based on such supposed evidence is demolished by the latest Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *theatrum*.¹ Perhaps the *internal* evidence cited in this article will serve to drive a nail in the coffin of Ritschl's theory and help to re-establish confidence in the prologues of Plautus as coming, in the main, from his own pen.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

¹ Pauly-Wissowa does not discuss how the curious belief arose that the Roman authorities, while officially arranging for theatrical performances, should for puritanical reasons have forbidden the spectators to sit. I suggest (1) that the wooden scaffolding or benches of Plautus' day left no visible trace for future ages to contemplate; (2) that some race-conscious Roman antiquarian, rather hurt at finding imposing tiers of stone seats in the theatres of *Greek* towns, tried to explain the absence of similar remains in Rome in a way which would flatter his countrymen's pride in the *mos maiorum*.

HYPERIDES AND THE CULT OF HEPHAESTION.

THE version of the anti-vulgate, represented by Arrian, on which even a supporter of the vulgate as keen as Plutarch (*Alex.*, 72, 3) is strangely dependent, and the tradition of Clitarchus, represented by Diodorus and Justin, differ widely, as is well known, in defining the honours conferred by Alexander upon his dead friend Hephaestion. Arrian (*Anab.*, VII, 14, 7; VII, 23, 6), who in all likelihood draws from Ptolemy his detailed and trustworthy information,¹ says that Alexander, however desirous he was to honour Hephaestion as a god, obeyed the answer of the oracle he had asked for, and ordered that his friend should be honoured as a hero; whereas, according to Justin (XII, 12, 12) and Diodorus (XVII, 115, 4), Ammon's response, confirming the wish of the king, was that Alexander was allowed to worship Hephaestion as a god: ἡκεν εἰς τῶν φίλων Φίλιππος,² says Diodorus, χρησμὸν φέρων παρ' Ἀμμωνος θύειν Ἡφαιστίῳ θεῷ.

Modern historians (e.g. Piaumann [*R.E.*, VIII, 295], Berve and Tarn) have unanimously followed the statement of Arrian and rejected the account of the vulgate. However right in their criticism of the extant sources, curiously enough they have all failed to quote, at least as far as I can see, a passage of a contemporary author which ought to have been emphasized, since it definitely bears witness to the extreme truthfulness and accuracy of Arrian. The passage I mean is to be found in the funeral oration of Hyperides, 21, l. 23 ff. (Jensen): [τ]οὺς <τοῦ> τῶν οἰκέτας ὥσπερ ἡρώας τιμᾶν ἡμᾶς ἀναγκαζομένους. The allusion to the heroic honours posthumously conferred upon Hephaestion is unmistakable, as several commentators have rightly pointed out,³ although they have

generally failed to note that this very passage of Hyperides probably suggested the remarks of Lucian in *Cal.* 17, which are therefore to be considered a statement as useful and valuable as the corresponding statement of Arrian.

This passage of Hyperides, if on the one hand it confirms the preference accorded by modern scholars to the testimony of Arrian (actually it is easy to understand the reasons, both moral and literary, which led Clitarchus to this dramatic embellishment of the episode), gives on the other hand definite evidence against the date generally proposed for the heroization of Hephaestion. It may suffice, choosing only one instance, to quote Berve.⁴ According to him it was in May of 323 B.C. that the envoys sent by Alexander to interrogate the oracle brought back to their king the response of the god. This late date is obviously wrong. Had the order been issued at Babylon only a few weeks before the death of Alexander, it would by no means have been possible for Greece and the Greek-speaking towns of Asia to establish and develop the cult of Hephaestion, the wide-spread existence of which some time before the outbreak of the Lamian war (early August of 323 B.C.) is attested by Hyperides. The cities would have had no time to pass individually the decree which probably was issued by every single town to give to the edict of Alexander legal validity within its area — just as the Athenians had been compelled to do slightly earlier (anyhow before the trial of the statesmen accused of having been bribed by Harpalus), when they had voted a resolution, proposed by Demades and supported by Demosthenes, by which the order of Alexander to worship him as a god had formally become a binding law of the Athenian state.

Whether Alexander's summons preceded or followed his campaign against the Cossaeans, we have no means of deciding, though the narrative of Arrian

¹ This passage of Arrian has been recently given a learned and satisfactory treatment by E. Kornemann, *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I* (Leipzig - Berlin, 1935), pp. 92, 94.

² For further details concerning this Philippus, I allow myself to refer to my article in Pauly-Wissowa, XIX, col. 2552.

³ Cf. H. Hess, *Textkritische u. erklärende Beiträge zum Epitaphios d. Hyp.* (Leipzig,

1938; in Jensen's *Studien*, XI), p. 67 ff.; G. Colin in *Rev. Études grecques*, LI (1938), pp. 309, 387.

⁴ *Das Alexanderreich*, II, p. 174.

seems to favour the second alternative. But this is immaterial. What matters—and it does matter for the short-lived history of Alexander's ruler-cult and world-kingdom—is that, according to the statement of Hyperides referred to

above, by the spring (i.e. April or early May at the latest) of 323 B.C. the hero-worship of Hephæstion had already spread throughout the Greek world.

P. TREVES.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE SECOND STORM AT ARTEMISIUM.

THE late Professor Bury's analysis¹ of the battle of Artemisium has done a great deal to clear up the difficulties in Herodotus' account. That Herodotus has put two extra days into the log of the army; that the fifty-three Athenian ships were the only Greek ships to retire to the Euripus; that the encircling fleet was sent, not from Aphetae but from farther up the coast, and that it was sent before, not after, the great storm—all this is, I believe, necessary correction of the account in the text, and renders it intelligible. What is not necessary is the suppression of the second storm.

According to Herodotus (VII, 188-191) the first storm was a three-day gale blowing from the Hellespont which hit the bulk of the Persian fleet before it had made Cape Sepias and smashed it against the Magnesian coast. Afterwards the Persians, fearing that the Greeks, who had returned to Artemisium (VII, 192), might escape, detached a special fleet to sail around Euboea and take the Greeks in the rear from the Euripus (VIII, 6-7); but Herodotus implies that this was done only after the main fleet had gathered itself together again at Aphetae. This main fleet was engaged by the Greeks late that afternoon (VIII, 9-11); the same evening another storm descended,

this time a heavy thunderstorm, which greatly depressed the Persians at Aphetae (VIII, 12), while it drove the encircling fleet against the Hollows of Euboea and destroyed it entirely (VIII, 13). News of this was brought to the Greeks next day as fifty-three Athenian ships also arrived to give them fresh hope (VIII, 14).

Bury argues that the encircling fleet was sent from some point up the Magnesian coast and before the storm.² This must surely be right; for only so does it make sense to say that it was sent behind Sciathos so as not to be seen by the Greeks (VIII, 7), and furthermore it is inconceivable that, starting from Aphetae well on in the day, it should reach the Hollows in time to be destroyed that night.³ These ships were therefore (at least they could have been) destroyed by the first storm; only Herodotus, having made them start after it, must have them wrecked by the second. Bury accordingly implies that the second storm, being no longer necessary, did not take place at all.⁴

But because a storm did no actual damage and wrecked no fleet, must it

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89-92.

² Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*², vol. II, 2, pp. 88-90 argues, chiefly on the basis of the time-problem, that the whole story of the encircling fleet is fictitious. He declares, on the analogy of Agathocles' voyage from Syracuse to Libya (Diod. XX, 6, 1), that the movement would have taken six days. But this squadron had a gale partly behind it, so that those ships which were not driven ashore must have gone very fast. Beloch further argues that the movement was bad strategy, and that Achaemenes (VII, 236) does not mention it. It may have been bad strategy and still have been attempted; and the speech of Achaemenes is hardly evidence against a plain narrative elsewhere in Herodotus.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 94. Cf. How and Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-375.

³ 'The Campaign of Artemisium and Thermopylae', *B.S.A.* II (1895-1896), pp. 83-104. In his subsequent *History of Greece* (pp. 274-275) he reverts in part to the 'orthodox' view and has the encircling squadron start from Aphetae, after the storm. There is a clear statement and defence of Bury's earlier view in How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, App. XX. This part of Bury's reconstruction has been followed also by Tarn, 'The Fleet of Xerxes', *J.H.S.* XXVIII (1908), pp. 202-233, and Macan, *Herodotus, Books VII-IX*, vol. II, pp. 272-279. Munro, *C.A.H.* IV, pp. 284-291, 316 also suppresses the second storm, but in order to fit a more elaborate hypothesis.

therefore be imaginary? The second storm as it is described from the point of view of the Persians at Aphetae is no doublet of the first. It is not a three-day gale but an all-night thunderstorm. The corpses washed in, apparently by tide and current, to foul the oars of the moored ships, intensify the depression of the drenched seamen; but there is nothing about a great wind. The effect on the sailors is moral; they gave themselves up for lost because of the bewildering succession in which gale, shipwreck, sea-fight and rainstorm had descended upon them. The account reads vividly, as if based on the story of one who had gone through the terror of a night which, if it ultimately did no damage, produced a very strong impression at the time.¹

¹ How, *loc. cit.*, thinks the account 'reads like a duplicate (of the first storm) with the exaggerations and graphic touches, taken perhaps from an epic poem' (what epic?) 'toned down or omitted'. To me the passage seems very real; but that is perhaps a matter of taste.

ΤΡΑΧΗΛΟΣ 'HEAD'.

THAT Greek used 'shoulder' in the sense of 'shoulder and arm' is common knowledge. The kindred fact that it used 'neck' for 'neck and head' I have nowhere seen stated. The word commonest in this extended sense was *τράχηλος*. Decapitation is described by Euripides (*Bacch.* 241) as *τράχηλον σώματος χωρίς τεμνέιν*,¹ and by Plutarch as *τράχηλον ἀποτέμνειν* or *ἀποκόπτειν*. Examples of *εἰς τράχηλον πεσεῖν* or the like meaning 'to fall on one's head' may be seen in Liddell and Scott.² In later Greek it may almost be said that *τράχηλος* and *κεφαλὴ* are synonymous. Arrian writes (*Epict. Diss.* 18, 17) *ἀλλ' ὁ τύραννος δέσσει. τί; τὸ σκέλος. ἀλλ' ἀφελεί. τί; τὸν τράχηλον*, whereas the impossibility of depriving anyone of his neck without also taking away his head is manifest. A herm had two prominent features: the phallus and the carved face. In descriptions of the mutilation of the herms we find *τράχηλος* used for the latter: Schol. Thuc. 6, 27, 1 *Πανσάντας ἐν τῇ διαπεποννημένῃ αὐτῷ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγῇ τοὺς τραχήλους καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα τοῦ Ἑρμῆς περικοπῆναι φησι*. The same wounds of Alexander are variously described thus: Plut. *Alex.* 45, 5 *λίθῳ πληγῆς εἰς τὸν τράχηλον*—Arr. *An.* 4, 3, 2 *βάλλεται λίθῳ τὴν τε κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸν αὐχένα*; Plut. *Alex.* 63, 9 *πληγῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ*

When, however, Herodotus speaks of the same storm from the point of view of the encircling fleet, it has become another gale (VIII, 13). There were, then, two storms, and Herodotus knew of both. In VIII, 12 he describes the second storm correctly as he heard of it, directly or indirectly, from someone who was at Aphetae.² But he was mistaken about the time when the encircling fleet started, and he had to call on the second storm to wreck it. And to do this he had to improve on his source. A storm like that described in VIII, 12 would not cause wholesale shipwreck; so whereas actually, perhaps, only the last survivors of the encircling fleet blundered against the Hollows in a driving rain, Herodotus had to transform this into a gale that wrecked the whole squadron.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pa., U.S.A.

² Perhaps Pytheas? Cf. Hdt. VII, 181; VIII, 92; Munro, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

τοῦ τραχήλου—Arr. *An.* 6, 11, 7 *ἐξὼς πληγέντα κατὰ τοῦ κράνους*. With the same extended force *αὐχὴν* and *δέρη* appear sometimes, though less frequently, to be found. In Euripides' *Cyclops* 87 ff. *ἀμφὶ δ' αὐχέσι τεύχη φέρονται κενά, βορᾶς κεχηρμένοι, κρωσσούς θ' ἰδρηλοῦς*, Odysseus' men were carrying the vessels in Greek fashion on their heads, as *ἀμφὶ*, which is used of a hat 'on' the head, suggests, and not round their necks. The tossing of the head characteristic of the maenad is described as *δέραν αἰθέρ' ἐν ὁροσερῶν βίπτουσα* (Eur. *Bacch.* 864 ff.), rendered by Catullus 63, 23 *ubi capita maenades vi iaciunt hederigerae* and by Tacitus, *Ann.* 11, 31 *tacere caput*, and as *ὀρυζομένην βεψαύχειν σὺν κλόνῳ* (Pindar fr. 224 Boeckh).

J. ENOCH POWELL.

University of Sydney.

HOW SOCRATES ADDRESSED THE JURY.

UP to the promulgation of sentence, and subsequently in addressing the jurors who had condemned him, the Platonic Socrates invariably says *ὦ ἄνδρες* or *ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, but he addresses the minority which absolved him with *ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί*, explaining *ἡμᾶς γὰρ δικαστὰς καλῶν ὁρθῶς ἂν καλοῖναι* (*Apol.* 40a 2; cf. 41a 1 *ἀπαλλαγῆς τούτων τῶν φασκόντων δικαστῶν εἶναι εὐρήσει τοὺς ὡς ἀληθῶς δικαστάς*).

This throws light on *Gorg.* 522c, a passage generally misunderstood, which should be punctuated as follows: (Socrates to Callias) *οὔτε τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐξω εἰπεῖν* (in court) *ὅτι Ἀκαίους*

¹ Cf. Lucan's *cervice recisa* (9, 213).

² The Americanism 'throw anyone out on his neck' may be parallel; but to me it conveys rather a fall on the occiput.

πάντα ταῦτα ἐγὼ λέγω καὶ πρῶτον—τὸ ὑμέτερον δὴ τοῦτο—ὡς ἄνδρες δικασταί· οὐτε ἄλλο οὐδέν. The group of words τὸ ὑμέτερον δὴ τοῦτο (cf. e.g. *Soph.* 233b 5 τὸ σὸν δὴ τοῦτο; *Gorg.* 508d 2 τὸ νεανικὸν δὴ τοῦτο τοῦ σοῦ λόγου; 514e 6 τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο; Aesch. *Myrmid.* PSI 1211, 6 [τόν,] τοῦτο δὲ, βροτοῖσιν ἱατρῶν πόνων) means 'to use the favourite formula of you orators' and is addressed to Callicles, not the jury. The words ὡς ἄνδρες δικασταί must be pronounced ironically, so that they are recognized as a quotation.¹ Here, then, as in the *Apology*, Socrates refuses to the jury the honourable title of 'judges', with which the orators were accustomed to flatter them. One may conjecture that the historical Socrates too addressed the jury with ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.

PAUL MAAS.

AESCHYLUS *EUM.* 480 (438).

κλέειν δίκαιους μάλλον ἢ πρᾶξι θέλει.

So M, with .ω. added by M² over the ου of δίκαιους, but ου is in a mess, and there has been erasure, which looks in the facsimile like an attempt to change ου to οι: the editors, however, say 'ου in litura'. F Tr. Ven. have δίκαιως. It has not to my knowledge been observed

¹ The ancient commentators evidently understood the passage aright: Schol. ap. Olympiod. (a leaf is lost in the archetype of the R-scholion) ἔθος γὰρ τοῖς ῥήτορσι πανταχοῦ λέγειν τὸ 'ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι'.

that the words of M's scholiast—θέλει αὐτὸν ἀπολογήσασθαι ἢ κατηγορεῖς αὐτοῦ ὡς πρᾶξαντος;—imply another reading, δίκαιοις.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ON THE MS. E OF AESCHYLUS.

In two recent editions of the *Agamemnon* (A. Y. Campbell, *The Ag.* of A., p. 65; G. Thomson, *The Oresteia* of A., passim) I find alleged readings of the codex Romanus (E) quoted from Wilamowitz, who had to rely upon an unscholarly collation (Praef. p. XX). Has not the time come to take account of Pasquali's corrections (Accad. dei Lincei, Rendic. della Classe di Scienze morali, Ser. VI, Vol. VI, 1930, p. 35 ff.)? It appears that at *Ag.* 369 there is no ἔπραξαν in that MS, at 833 no φθόνιον, at 1443 no ἰσοτρυχίης, etc.

EDUARD FRAENKEL.

Oxford.

SOPHOCLES, *O.T.* 292 AND 566.

PROFESSOR R. C. FLICKINGER writes from Iowa City to point out that ὁδοιπορῶν for ὁδοιπόρων in 292, and κανόντος for θανόντος in 566, which were suggested in *C.R.* LII. 210, were adopted in the text of M. L. Earle's edition (Chicago, 1901), where the former was attributed to Sehrwald (1863) and the latter to van Herwerden.

REVIEWS

EARLY GREEK ELEGISTS.

C. M. BOWRA: *Early Greek Elegists.*

Pp. x+208. London: Oxford University Press, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS book contains the text of six lectures delivered by Dr. Bowra as lecturer on the Martin Foundation at Oberlin College. The period covered is from the origins of elegy down to Simonides. The first lecture, entitled 'Origins and Beginnings', deals with the nature and subjects of the earliest elegy, and with Archilochus, Callinus and Mimnermus, including a short digression on the single elegiac fragment ascribed to Simonides of Amorgos. Lectures on Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes and Theognis follow; and the last lecture deals with Simonides and the sepulchral epigram, including Archilochus, Cleobulus, Anacreon, and a

selection of the anonymous epigrams of the period. Footnotes are confined to references, and there is an index of names and (for some authors) of passages quoted.

The state of the evidence makes it very hard to give a reasonable and coherent account of the early elegists at all, and in this case the difficulties must have been increased by the form in which the account was to be given. The limitation of the subject to elegy involved the omission of the iambic and trochaic fragments of Archilochus and Solon, with the risk of giving a distorted impression of their works and personalities; and the restriction of the course to six lectures must have made it hard to apportion the available space fairly between the various authors,

especially in view of the differences in the quantity and quality of their extant works.

Dr. Bowra is to be congratulated on the manner in which he has faced these difficulties. His work on the lyric poets showed that he possesses great skill in reconstructing the personality of a poet from the fragments, and he has made full use of that skill here. The poets are presented as credible human beings, their relation to the history and thought of their times is lightly but firmly sketched, and the fragments are well arranged to illustrate the points made. The difficulties presented by Archilochus and Solon are perhaps not fully surmounted (Dr. Bowra's Archilochus is not Pindar's or Horace's), but the inclusion of the iambic and trochaic fragments would rather amplify than alter the picture. The distribution of space among the several authors is not altogether satisfactory: Xenophanes receives nearly five times as much as Archilochus, a tribute to his importance in the history of Greek thought rather than to his eminence as an elegist (this is suggested by the fact that his hexameter poems are discussed side by side with his elegiacs), and the consideration of Theognis is limited to the poems addressed to Cyrnus. Dr. Bowra argues that these alone are certainly genuine, but there are many other poems in the collection which must fall within the period and would be worthy of detailed study. But it is hard to see how room could have been found for them.

The exposition is in general simple and straightforward. Minute discussion is avoided, and controversy is limited to such major problems as the origin of Tyrtaeus, the composition of the *Theognidea* and the authorship of some of the epigrams ascribed to Simonides, which are briefly dealt with. Elsewhere Dr. Bowra confines himself to stating his own views, not always with an indication that alternative opinions exist (e.g. on the date of Archilochus and on the date and nature of the

'Lycurgan' constitution at Sparta). His views on these and other points and his interpretations of the texts may not always command assent, but they are always lucidly and often brilliantly expressed, and there are few places where he seems to me to run counter to fact or logic. Among these few are the statement that 'except for Tyrtaeus no poet who worked in Sparta has claims to be called a Spartan' (p. 40), which overlooks Alcman, whose claims were known to Antipater of Thessalonica (*A.P.* 7.18), to Velleius Paterculus (who hotly denied them: 1.18.2) and to Suidas' authority (who defended them); and the argument that because Theognis is known to have addressed verses to Cyrnus and many of the *Theognidea* are addressed to Cyrnus, therefore all the verses addressed to Cyrnus are 'unquestionably genuine' (p. 142). It is a pity that room could not have been found for supplementary notes on controversial and difficult points.

The Greek text of all but the longest fragments is printed in full, and verse translations are appended to all the passages quoted. The texts are mainly taken from the latest edition of Diehl, even to Hermann's *κακὸν* for *καλὸν* in *Mimn.* 1.6 (p. 17: the MS reading is assumed in the translation and discussion), but in some cases Diehl's text is changed without warning or argument (e.g., on p. 125 *τὸν δὲ* is read for Diehl's *τόνος* in *Xenoph.* 1.20). The translations are by many hands, though most are by Dr. Bowra himself. They would provide material for a long essay on the art of translation: here it can only be said that for the purpose Dr. Bowra's are the best, since they are almost always accurate and in plain English. Most of the important modern works are referred to in the footnotes. The references to Alcaeus and Sappho are by Lobel's numeration only (a most inconsiderate practice).

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

HIPPOCRATES.

Max POHLENZ: *Hippokrates und die Begründung der wissenschaftlichen Medizin*. Pp. 120. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938. Cloth, RM. 6.

THIS is an exciting book, rather like a detective story told in reverse order. Instead of the clues first and the answer at the end, here we have the answer on the title-page and a selection of clues in the pages that follow. If we are determined to catch Hippocrates, perhaps that is our only hope; he is such an elusive person. But still, he is a person; he wrote; and some of what he wrote survives. Pohlenz, very rightly, lays it down at the outset that we must get at the persons who wrote the various treatises in the Corpus; we must get a clear notion of each author's personality; date him, and work out what other thinkers and writers there were with whom he could have had personal contact; then to crown all we must try to identify one such author with Hippocrates himself. As the two treatises most likely to fit the predetermined answer, Pohlenz chooses *π. ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων* (which for his purpose he re-names 'On the Influence of Environment', or 'On Environment' for short) and *π. ἱεπῆς νόσου*. Many theories in recent times have attempted to explain the marked difference between the two parts of *Airs Waters Places*; Pohlenz's solution is amazingly simple: Style, thought, exposition are similar in both parts; but only a first-hand observer could have produced Part two. Hence, the same author wrote both parts, but in between he paid a visit to Pontus for study and observation. The attribution, originally made by Wilamowitz, of *Sacred Disease* and *A.W.P.* to one and the same author is approved, and we are told that *S.D.* was written before *A.W.P.*

Who was the author? He owes much to Alcmaeon, but he was not Alcmaeon; he owes something to

Diogenes, but he was not Diogenes; he and Polybus have much in common, but he was not Polybus. Further, he must have kept an accurate case-book. Why should not that case-book be *Epidemics I* and *III*? And, allowing for change of views on certain points over a decade, *Epidemics II*, *IV* and *VI*, and perhaps *π. χυμῶν*, could be by him too. All these, with the addition of *Prognostic*, provide us with a fairly wide range of material. Can we make it tally with the references to Hippocrates which we find in Aristotle and Plato? Yes—if we are careful. Aristotle's views are mediated to us through Menon's *Iatrica*, recast by some later redactor (*vide* Deichgräber), and finally served up by the Anonymus Londiniensis. Strip off the accretions, and then what Aristotle and Plato have to say of Hippocrates fits in very well with the outlook of *S.D.*, *A.W.P.* and the rest.

As an exercise, the book is extremely interesting; as a case, it is not proven, and it is fair to Pohlenz to say that he admits it. Too many points have to be stretched; too many benefits of the doubt have to be given. And if Hippocrates really lived to be 104, and really lived to receive in person Plato's 'complimentary composition' (the *Phaedrus*), and travelled, what views may he not have held and in what styles may he not have indited? Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent.

Even if we write off the attempt at identification, there remains a good deal that is of interest in the book, for instance, the studies on the relationship of the treatises, on the growth and development of Greek medical theory, and on the influence of 'Hippocrates' in later times. All this, and the notes, will be of general interest and value, and for this the book will be welcome.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

THUCYDIDES' STATESMAN.

G. F. BENDER: *Der Begriff des Staatsmannes bei Thukydides*. Pp. iv + 115. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938. Paper, RM. 4.

DR. BENDER would show us that citizens need a *Führer*, and that for Thucydides Pericles is the canon, and by this canon considers Nicias, Alcibiades and Her-

mocrates (as Thucydides portrays them). The qualities needed are those summed up succinctly in Pericles' own speech, ii 60. 5-6: *γνῶναι τὰ δέοντα, ἐρμηνεύσαι ταῦτα, φιλόπολιν εἶναι, χρημάτων κρείσσονα εἶναι*—so succinctly that Bender finds it necessary to explain at length. Thus the first is to be understood not only by the greater detail given in the characterization of Themistocles (i 138. 3), but as including will-power in action and *τόλμα*. Yet, by frequently noting that wise decisions may be brought to nothing by weakness in action, Thucydides shows that he was well aware of the distinction between intellect and will; and he should have expressed the distinction here, if he meant what Bender thinks. The third quality is made to include the complete 'oneness' of *Führer* with *Volk*; yet by this Alcibiades would be more *φιλόπολις* than Nicias, which of course Bender does not allow, and Hermocrates hardly *φιλόπολις* at all—when he discusses these statesmen Bender takes the word in its more limited meaning. He has much that is useful, if not original, when he shows the thread of ideas running through Thucydides' work, and parallels with other authors; but his weakness is his assumption that on every occasion Thucydides said all he had ever thought on a subject, and also expected his readers to know his history by heart (e.g., vi 36. 1, *τῇ πόλει οὐκ εὖνους*, 'recalls' ii 60. 6, *τῇ πόλει δύσνους*); and it was surely unnecessary to

devote several pages to proving that Nicias was no born *Führer seines Volkes* and that Alcibiades' ambitions were personal. Bender's history is sometimes at fault, as when he says that the early Athenian leaders, all of the nobility (including Themistocles?), were true leaders, not party men nor selfish. He misinterprets Thucydides' meaning at times, as *εὐοργήτως*, i 122. 1 ('mit verständigem Eifer'), *ἀπραγμοσύνη* ('Untätigkeit' simply), the equation of *ἐγώ* and 'my country' by Hermocrates (iv 64. 1, vi 78. 1, 3), which has no political significance. I need hardly add that there is constant confusion between three different views of the speeches, that they represent the substance of what was said, that they are Thucydides' own composition but intended to be proper to the occasion, that they are his composition and represent his own mature thoughts.

Dr. Bender is well read, if good reading be confined to what has been written in German of recent years; but his book is not easy to read owing to the unsystematic division of his material between text and lengthy footnotes. There is no index of passages, and no bibliography; and the value of many of his references to obscurer articles is almost nullified by the frequency of 'a.o.', which necessitates a search through all previous footnotes to discover the source.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

A REVISED TEXT OF MENANDER.

Menandri quae supersunt. Pars prior.

Tertium edidit Alfredus KOERTE.

Pp. lxxviii + 150. Leipzig: Teubner, 1938. Cloth, (export price) RM. 5.70.

JENSEN'S arrangement of the papyrus fragments of Menander in his edition (1929) has given a new stability to the text, and between him and Koerte (whose first volume contains all the papyri) is less difference than between any other two editions. But Koerte has new things to say and corrections to make, and his edition is an admirably balanced presentation of the results so far achieved.

In form the new Teubner volume

still lacks the spaciousness of the Weidmann text, but one advance on Jensen is the inclusion of notes on Actio.¹

The study of Menander has not stood still since 1929. Guéraud's re-examination of the Cairo papyrus, since Koerte learned of it too late, has perhaps not yet had its full effect on the text, though the main results appear in the notes.

¹ Another is the renumbering in *Epitrepontes*. There is now only one line 1. I quote Koerte's lines. There are several small misprints. Important errors are: *Perik.* 170, n. ('Myrrinae', not 'Polemonis', is meant: v. p. XXXI); *ib.* 174 (*θαῖρον* omitted in text).

But, besides including the few new fragments, K. improves on Jensen in several important points (e.g. reinstatement of Laches for Phidias, *Heros* 65 sq.; reinterpretation of *Perik.* 344 sq. with Schwartz and Gomme) and many smaller matters. In *Epitrepontes* he returns often to Wilamowitz's views (*KAP.* v. 446, clearly right, is at last received into the text): only at v. 36 sq., assigned questioningly to Smicrines, does this seem a retrogression. Jensen's argument for Onesimus is strong, though by him overstated; and K.'s question (p. XIX), 'at cur processit Onesimus' etc., is not unanswerable. Charisius wants to know the result of Smicrines's visit, so Onesimus is sent out to investigate and returns to report.

Editors of Menander are perhaps too anxious to present a readable text. Ambitious reconstruction in Sudhaus's or Jensen's manner often helps to bring a question to a head, but small *exempli gratia* supplements sometimes merely

disturb the reader; see for instance *Perik.* 381-2, 394-5, *Sam.* 266 in this text. In *Perik.* 332 (Γλ.) τί ἔστιν; is surely impossible. Even if Doris is distressed, Glycera cannot both raise and drop the subject all in one line. But the whole interpretation of that scene is very doubtful. At *Epitr.* 537 Sudhaus's supplement, though specious, is open to question. Can Habrotonon appropriately say προῆλθε (so J. and K.) or even προσῆλθε of Pamphile? And should she raise the baby's hopes at this stage? And would not lacunae have been less unusual in Menander than the words τρανέ[ς] (*Heros* 96) and τὰρ[φεῖς] (*Θεοφ.* 16)?

Such questions arise. But Koerte convinces far oftener than not, and his judgment is always valuable. It is to be hoped that his second volume, containing the other fragments and a general index, will soon complete this excellent edition. W. E. MUIR.

University of Glasgow.

PAPYRI AT MILAN.

A. VOGLIANO: *Papiri della R. Università di Milano*. Volume primo. Pp. xxii + 275; 3 plates. Milan: Hoepli, 1937. Cloth, L. 500.

THIS volume inaugurates the publication of the Milan Papyri. It contains 28 Greek texts, of which 22 are literary; and ten Arabic, of which one is notable for its early date.

The Greek literary texts open with five from the *Iliad*: I. 39-55, II. 155-209 (omitting 168, 206), III. 106-26 (not hitherto found in papyri), VII. 232-49 (omitting 234), XXIII. 451-63. No. 6 contains Ap. Rhod. I. 699-719 with glosses and marginal notes: it agrees with an emendation of La Roche in 702. There follow No. 7, fragments of Aeolic lyric; No. 8, fourteen very mutilated lines of Menander(?); No. 8 bis, literary scraps; No. 9, Plato, *Phaedr.* 267b-268c; No. 10, Plato, *Rep.* 485d, 486c. No. 11 (1st cent. A.D.) is a letter addressed by Theon to Heraclides, in which the recipient is given advice about a course of reading in the Stoic philosophers and a list of recommended books. Nos. 12 and 13 are from Demosthenes, *De Cor.* 85-6 and *De F. Leg.*

194-5. Nos. 14-16 contain medical texts. Next come the two most important items in the collection. No. 17 contains the curious commentary on the *Artemis* (so Maas, almost certainly rightly) and *Thebais* of Antimachus, already published by Vogliano in 1935 and after him by Wyss. This document may not add much to our knowledge of Antimachus himself, since most of the *lemmata* are very short, but the commentator's diffuseness and the excellence of his sources provide us with new fragments of Panyassis, Mimnermus (*Smyrneis*), Callimachus (*Aetia*), Hecataeus, Hagias and Dercylus, Theophrastus (*περὶ ὑδάτων*). Since the *ed. prim.* various scholars, especially Maas, have contributed to the elucidation of this difficult text, but much still remains obscure. In line 24 Vogliano's supplement λύμα[ρ]ος seems wrong, the sense surely requiring αἵμα[ρ]ος. No. 18 contains the now famous *Diegeseis* of the poems of Callimachus, first published by Norsa and Vitelli in 1934. Vogliano has since identified two new fragments, Fr. A and Fr. B, as belonging to the roll. Fr. B comes from the top of

Col. I of the *ed. prim.*, and Fr. A from the top of the previous column, here named Z by Vogliano. Fr. A contains the beginning of the *diegesis* of the *Cydic*, while Fr. B contains fragments of two new *lemmata* and their *diegeseis*. The first of the two elegies, whose existence is thus revealed, apparently dealt with a prenuptial rite in Elis, and it seems probable that the clue to Callimachus' treatment of his subject is to be found in Fr. 383. Vogliano has made other additions, and throughout has revised and supplemented the readings of the first editors. He discusses many suggestions made by scholars since 1934. Particularly important is his demonstration (pp. 73-4 and 137-8) that PSI 1216 contains *Iambi* 4-6. After the commentary L. Castiglioni contributes an essay on the language and style of the *Diegetes*, and P. Maas adds three excursuses on the literary form of the *Diegeseis* and the *Scholia Florentina*, and other matters connected with Callimachus. Finally Vogliano himself discusses the identification of

PSI 1218c with *Dieg.* Col. III. 12 sqq. Of the remaining literary texts, No. 19 consists in the *subscriptio* to the *Συτήματα γραμματικά* of Apollodorus of Athens, a work, we here learn, dealing with *Iliad* XIV; No. 20 contains some rather feeble 'sophistic' essays; No. 21 is more interesting, since it contains a prayer of Alexander the Great to Sarapis, perhaps forming part of a romance; finally No. 22 gives us *Exodus*, 29. 21-4. In his *Addenda* and *Corrigenda* Vogliano has found room for a discussion of the Sappho ostrakon published by Medea Norsa.

Generally speaking the book is not altogether easy to handle owing to a certain diffuseness and weakness in arrangement, but the state of constant flux in which Callimachean studies find themselves at present is an adequate excuse for this so far as the *Diegeseis* are concerned. It is certainly a book in which to browse, and the three plates, one of the Antimachus and two of the *Diegeseis*, will be very useful. E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

ADLER'S SUIDAS.

Suidae *Lexicon*, edidit Ada ADLER.

Pars IV: π-ψ. Pp. xv + 864.

Pars V: Indices, etc. Pp. 280.

Leipzig: Teubner, 1936-8. Export prices: paper, RM. 40.50 and 13.50; bound, 42 and 15.

WITH the publication of these two volumes Frau Adler's invaluable edition of the *Lexicon* of Suidas is brought to completion, and all scholars will be grateful to her for providing them with a reliable text and most useful apparatus. In noticing previous volumes we have observed that A. does not as a rule admit corrections into the text even where this is clearly corrupt, except in a few cases (such as 'Αλβάνω for Δαβάνω s.v. *Τιμαγένης*) where the true reading is beyond doubt. Thus s.v. *Σέλλιος* we read in the text *πρὸ Μενάνδρου*, where the preposition (as appears from what is said s.v. *Ὀμηρος*) clearly conceals some form of the word *περιοχαί*, as was pointed out by Meineke, to whom reference is made in the apparatus. So too *Ξάνταις* stands s.v. *τεντάζειν*, where *Ξαντρίαίς* is of course

correct (the note gives 'Ξαντρίαίς recte Bhd. '); and 'Αρκεσίμην might well have been corrected to 'Αρκεσίμην s.v. *Σιμμία*. The practical reader will, however, learn by experience how to find the information which he needs; and he will no doubt accustom himself to A.'s habit of referring to authors named in the text by the numbers assigned to them in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*; Aristodemus (never cited by name in the *Lexicon*) is suggested by the entry in a few cases 'eiusdem generis quam FG¹ Hist 104'). It is not clear what is meant by 'τακτικόν recte A' in the critical note on *τί λέγεις σύ* (where Aristophanes *Nub.* 1171-6 is cited). The note on *σκαισίνη* 'extat ap. Soph. Bhd.' is a curiosity. A. has expended much labour and ingenuity in tracing the sources of the entries in the *Lexicon*, and her guarded statements rarely invite criticism: we might suggest that *τοκάς* comes from Eubulus (*Fr.* 145) rather than from Homer. Much naturally remains uncertain—this applies especially to the

numerous quotations ascribed by A. or other scholars to Aelian. It is not clear why she is so positive in putting down to this author the phrases cited s.v. *πληθύνουσιν* and s.v. *ὑπερόπτης*; and it is fairly safe to assume that he is not responsible for a quotation in which *ξύν* appears for *σύν* (s.v. *οἰωνίζοντο*). A study of the index shows that alternatives to Aelian are to be found in writers differing widely in time—Polybius, Nicolaus of Damascus, Eunapius, Iamblichus, Damascius, Priscus, and Symeon Metaphrastes. The last-named seems to be a favourite with A.; here the index shows that in seven instances he is an alternative to a supposed historian of the class to which *F.Gr.Hist.* 151 (the *Fragmentum Sabbaiticum*) belongs. It is interesting to note that some authors (e.g. Diogenes Laertius and Georgius Monachus) are never quoted by name.

Special attention may be drawn to

the full and extremely valuable account of the MSS. of Suidas which follows the indices; this supplements and in detail corrects A.'s article in Pauly-Wissowa; she has convinced herself that the interpolated entries were to be found in the copy used by Eustathius.

The proof-reading is extremely accurate. For '*FGrHist* 115' read '*FGrHist* 151' s.v. *περίσταμαι*. 'Nymphiodorus' should be 'Nymphodorus' s.v. *ταλασιουργία*. In the index s.v. *Interpretatio Psalmorum* an asterisk is needed to show that *Δαβίδ* is cited IV 666. 14, and *ὁ προφήτης* should be noted where it occurs.

On the last page of Vol. V. Dölger's explanation of the correct title of the Lexicon—*ἡ Σοῦδα*—is referred to, but not, as might be expected, reproduced in detail: see however A.'s notice in *Gnomon* xiii 575.

H. STUART JONES.

NONIUS AND VARRO'S POETRY.

Francesco DELLA CORTE: *La Poesia di Varrone Reatino ricostituita*. (Estratto dalle Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino.) Pp. 102. Turin: R. Accademia delle Scienze, 1938. Paper.

It has long been a difficulty to determine Nonius' method of compilation. Did he use glossaries or peruse authors? Did expert slaves devil for him? What regulated his order in citations? To such questions the author addresses himself in ch. I. As over 90 per cent. of Varro's poetic fragments come from Nonius, this work opens with an account of his chief preserver and an investigation into Nonius' methods. Its broad pages facilitate by lists of words the exhibition of the order in which Nonius quoted for his *lemmata* from authors still extant like Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Sallust, Virgil, and from portions of Cicero. Anomalous departures from a regular order can be in large measure explained. Clearly to establish such a system helps towards indicating the relative position of many fragments in Varro's lost satires. Della Corte contends that Nonius used three collections of Varro's poetry: 18 *Saturae Menippeae* arranged chronologically

(ch. II), *Menippeae* with double title (ch. III), and *Saturarum libri* IV, independent of the *Menippeae* (ch. IV).

But beyond these three *corpora* there remain for survey fragments of minor works almost insignificant and yet helpful in the hitherto neglected history of the survival of Varro, who, because of certain archaizing tendencies, was linked in glossaries and grammatical treatises with earlier poets—Ennius, Accius and Lucilius. So the author turns in ch. V to fragments of other satires and *pseudo-tragoediae* drawn from two glossaries predominantly dramatic in material, although the later one contains words from Virgil and Laevius. Ch. VI discusses the double tradition of Varro's poetic works—one group approved by Varro; the other, political or satiric, circulated among Pompeian friends, so that some satires lived on apart from works known to Nonius. The Appendix gives reasons against dismissing the *Sententiae Varronis* as a falsification.

Della Corte's treatment of *Marcipor* exemplifies his method. Following the succession of Nonius' *lemmata*, he re-constructs the relative position of 8 out of 19 fragments, and then re-creates the

episodes of a journey comparable with that in Lucilius and Horace. The customary reading in *ambivio navem conscendimus* he alters to in *Ambivio* . . ., postulating an innkeeper Ambivius so well known that his name expressed his locality. In the episode of the Argonauts and Medea he argues from phraseology and syntax that the story may follow the version which descended to Hyginus. The Marcus in the title-word is identified with the Roman *eques* Marcus Seius.

Similar conjectural identifications pervade the study and, if accepted, bear on dating. Some are ingenious, if unproved: e.g. the change in *Andabatae* of Plautus' *luscitiosus* to *lusciosus* in allusion to Lucius Luscus, condemned as a profiteer in 64 B.C.; in *Agatho* the reference suggested is to Licinius Lucullus, consul 74, who might be called 'the Agathon of the Romans'; fr. 110 and fr. 447 *pleni* is taken as *P. Leni*, another form of *Lenaeus*, Pompey's freedman; fr. 397 the corrupt *paciin* may conceal *Pacvi* = *Pacuvii*; fr. 385 Buecheler's ἀρκυας is replaced by *Archias*, whose surviving Greek epigrams on the chase suit the hunting terminology in the satire; fr. 379, if *ales gallus* contains a proper name, we are offered a choice between

the rhetor Plotius Gallus and one of Euphorion's imitators, Cornelius Gallus, in which latter case Buecheler's *Atticarum* (for *†aittharum*) is changed to *aetiarum* in allusion to Callimachus' Αἴτια.

The title *Modius*, usually taken as a measure, is applied to Modius Equiculus whom Varro mentions in *De Re Rustica* as interested in horses. We are, then, in a realm of conjecture, stimulating and often plausible, but not always secure enough to found dates upon.

One great value of the work lies in the attention called to Nonius' system of citation. It is useful also to have the case stated for believing, in opposition to Cichorius, that Varro resumed writing *Menippeae* after Caesar's murder.

Some references to the fragments have wrong numbers. Other slips are (p. 23) *probiscis*; (28) *choeran*; (20) *veretrum* for the decent and correct *verutum*; (55) *admondum*; (59) *esculso*; (61) *rhythmo*; (54 and 66) *ευκαπιας*; (68) *φθορης*; (74) *εως* for *εως*; (80) *deverbia*; (82) *sumpta* for *sumptu*; *prospicies* for *prospiciens*; (83) fr. 251 *parcet* is meaningless and should be *procel*, explained as *prohibet*, Nonius, 160; (99, l. 4) *satire* must mean *sententiae*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

LATIN COMEDIES FROM THE GREEK.

W. E. J. KUIPER: (1) *Diphilus' doel en deel in de Rudens van Plautus*. Pp. 115. (Attische Familiekomedies van omstreken 300 v. Chr., II.) Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1938. Stiff paper, fl. 1.50. (2) *Two Comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus: Terence's Hecyra and Phormio*. Pp. vii + 101. Leyden: Brill, 1938. Paper, 2.50 guilders.

HAVING begun his series of 'Attic Domestic Comedies' with the *Epidicus*, Professor Kuiper now turns to the *Rudens*, and shows no decrease of ingenuity. He has the mind of a first-class writer of detective stories; and this is high praise. But I feel that he probably does not read detective stories, since otherwise he would be more conscious (1) that it is often possible to imagine several different reconstructions

all of which will fit a given set of facts, and (2) that it is always easy to over-estimate the significance of a clue, especially when evidence is scanty. Nevertheless he shows much better judgement than most of his predecessors in this field. In particular, his general theory of act-division is more logical than any yet produced; the only question is whether ancient practice accorded with it. Playwrights do not always anticipate the canons to be laid down for them by analytical posterity.

No doubt Professor Kuiper is alive to the dangers of the Procrustean method, but he sometimes seems to hanker after it. One would almost think, for example, that on the Greek stage every 'sympathetic' *meretrix* was bound not only to be restored to citizenship but to be married to her half-brother; and

that any elderly person who appears briefly or is only named in the Latin version of a play is liable to exposure as an unmarried parent. But even in the conventional New Comedy we can see development and experiment: not all the plays will fit into the same mould. The *Rudens* is exceptional for its setting, and this fact endangers other conventions besides those of the wing-entrances. We know from the *Περικειρομένη* that in Menander the chorus might at least make a glancing contact with the action, and common sense suggests that its personnel should not be alien to the atmosphere of the play. How would a chorus of 'revelers' suit the *Rudens*? How could their presence be explained? For on Professor Kuiper's view (p. 10, by a hazardous inference from 266-9) the temple is a sailing-distance from the city. It is easier to believe in the fishermen.

But the real difficulty lies in the reconstruction of Ptolemaic's original rôle—that she had been the victim of Demones' youthful passion, but had no clue to his identity except a ring; that Plesidippus was her son, exposed at birth with this ring as a token, and reared as a foundling; that in Diphilus' play she, and not Trachalio, took part in Scenes 2 and 3 of Act III (the evidence for this is most tenuous); that she recognized this ring after it had been given by Plesidippus to Palaestra, and in her anxiety to prove the latter's free birth showed it to Demones, who knew it for his own and so identified his son, but kept the secret dark—all this, though brilliant, seems highly conjectural.

The reconstructions of the *Hecyra* and *Phormio* are more convincing because less radical. This is not to say that the doubling of the ἀναγνώρισις in the former by a duplicate-ring motif is not a little hard to credit; but the argument is so complex that it cannot be examined briefly. In the *Phormio* most of the changes centre round the reconstructed recognition of Pamphila as Demipho's daughter. This is inferred (mainly, it would seem) from Donatus on 646-7 in *Graeca fabula senex hoc dicit*: 'quid interest me non suscepisse filiam, si modo dos dabitur alienae?' But does *non suscepisse* represent μή ἀνελέσθαι or μή ποιήσασθαι? Cf. 943, 967, 1007.

Professor Kuiper's methods are illustrated by the 'register of sins', eighteen in number, on pp. 66-7. I have only space to comment upon one or two points. May not 877 (*Sin 12*) *atque hercle ego quoque illam inaudiui fabulam* be sarcastic, 'Oh yes, I've heard that story too!'? And could Terence write 819 (*Sin 18*) *at tu intro abi* without realizing that he had scrapped the contrasting 'but I'll wait'? Or how could he (p. 37) 'forget' Bacchis's *ancillae*? Even if Terence himself was careless, which he was not, he had the advice and criticism of expert friends, and his plays were not only produced but rehearsed—the *Hecyra* three times. Such lapses, if they were lapses, could not possibly have been overlooked.

But let criticism rest; we look forward to seeing more of Professor Kuiper's work, especially now that he has shown that he can write in excellent English.

HUGH TREDENNICK.

Queen Mary College,
University of London.

INTERPOLATION IN TERENCE.

Peter FEHL: *Die interpolierte Recension des Terenztextes*. Pp. 152. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Klassische Philologie.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM 6.50.

AFTER a lull the vexed question of the text of Terence is taken up with vigour by a pupil of Jachmann. His procedure is to sort out (as others, though in less detail, have done) the notorious corruptions of the minuscule MSS (Σ)

and, having characterized them as they are 'writ large' there, to look for similar corruptions in Codex Bezae (A) and even, by inference, in the common parent of Σ and A, namely Φ . It has been recognized, of course, that, besides many purely scribal lapses, A shows the effects of more deliberate interference; but F. is the first to make plain its nature and extent. In about seventy lines there is good reason for supposing that the A-version is the

result of more or less conscious meddling. The moral is obvious—we have set too high a value on some of the readings of *A* out of respect for its general excellence—and the application immediate—where a reasoned statement of evidence points to corruption the readings of *A* must be discarded.

A full list of *A*'s corruptions is not possible here, but we may say summarily that *A*, like Σ , adds the verb 'to be' and other 'understood' verbs, besides nouns and pronouns; substitutes the normal for the less familiar formula; adds intensive particles; adds causal connexions and others which Terentian asyndeton omits; substitutes the regular tense and mood for the unusual or archaic; etc.

Not that many of these corruptions have deceived editors of Terence; but, if we add another fifty passages where *A* shares the same type of error with Σ , we have a clear view of a weakness of *A*'s and are prepared to recognize it in the less obvious instances. Among such may be cited *Hec.* 734 (*mihi*), *Eun.* 303 (*ei*), *Hec.* 597 (second *me*), *Eun.* 821 (*aut*), *Haut.* 1027 (second *quod*), *Ad.* 353 (*respiciet*), *Haut.* 854 (*desponderis*), *Phorm.* 494 (*somnia*), *Haut.* 747 (*dammum*), *Eun.* 656 (*monstrum*), *Haut.* 689 (*tutum*).

To have done so much definitively is a real service to Terentian studies, but F. goes on to use his material as a stepping-stone towards the dating of the Calliopian text. Here his arguments are far from convincing. He says that Σ and *A* and Φ are all 'interpolated' texts. That is granted. Presently, however, he talks as if *A* were as much 'interpolated' as Σ , from which it would follow that the Calliopian text originated no later than *A*, that is, somewhere about A.D. 300. But surely the comparison Φ (interpolated), *A* (more interpolated), Σ (most interpolated) in itself suggests a late origin for the Calliopian text. In the matter of corruptions Σ resembles rather the text which would result from a copy of *A* embodying all the 'corrections' of Jovialis.

F. insists that all (or nearly all) the 'interpolations' are fully deliberate, i.e. those of a 'Textbearbeiter', 'Herausgeber', 'Recensor' etc., thus prac-

tically ruling out the scribal error and the incorporated gloss. Further, evidence is piled up, not only from Terence, but from Plautus, Seneca (Tragedies), Persius and Martial, to prove that there was a universal tendency towards similar 'interpolation' during the third and fourth centuries.

This two-handed engine is designed to smite Lindsay's hypothesis (only a hypothesis, but one which attempted to account for all the facts) of the 'pupil-editor' who ignorantly incorporated in the lines of Terence what were Calliopius' explanatory notes. According to F. no special account is needed of the origin of the Calliopian text. It is simply one among many other 'interpolated' texts. F. disregards entirely the *Calliopius recensui* and the *Feliciter Calliope bono scholastico* of the *Subscriptiones*, which deserve mention at least. But on the larger question he does not see that not only the incorporated gloss but even many scribal modifications must have a purposive appearance. It is false doctrine that editors are more to blame for corrupt texts than copyists (intelligent as well as mechanical). And the argument from authors other than Terence is irrelevant. They are none of them so hopelessly corrupt as the Calliopian Terence.

F. by his theory of deliberate editing is compelled to postulate ignorance of Terentian metre at a very early date. But his quotations from Juvenal (viii, 66 and v, 112) on pp. 75 and 95, and from Martial (I, 21, 7) on p. 115, would similarly imply ignorance of the hexameter—which is incredible.

F. makes much of the evidence of the recently discovered palimpsest fragment of Terence, the *Fragmentum Sangallense*, to show that the Calliopian text existed about A.D. 300. But the one unmistakable explanatory addition of Σ (*nam* in *Haut.* 878) is not in the text of the fragment. F. does not mention this.

The reviewer concludes that the late-third-century date for the Calliopian text is not confirmed, but he recognizes the great value of F.'s contribution to our knowledge of *A* and of the errors which deface the text of Terence.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

LATIN WORD-ORDER.

Herbert FANKHÄNEL: *Verb und Satz in der lateinischen Prosa bis Sallust; eine Untersuchung über die Stellung des Verbs*. Pp. 273. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Band 182.) Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 10.

THIS book is an attempt to explain the developments in Latin word-order, and especially in the position of the verb, in the period finishing with Sallust. The author studies the verb at the beginning, the middle and the end of the sentence, and he uses throughout the historical method, showing how, for example, a position traceable in Cato becomes common in Sallust.

Probably the method is the most valuable part of the book. It is clearly better to try to trace word-order in its history than to infer its development from its mature state in Cicero. But it might have been better to risk expanding the book by including Cicero, who represents the end of a stage of growth better than Sallust.

In another sense also the method is excellent. By a process which is akin to dialectic, the author works through almost the same set of facts three times, and elicits from them a threefold line of development, by which the verb went to the beginning, the middle or the end.

The account is as follows. In the earliest form of sentence there was perhaps a combination of two noun-ideas. To this combination a verb was added, playing the part, as Quintilian says, of closing the sense. F. illustrates this stage from Plautus, who has many sentences with a subject and object in one line, and the verb in the following line. An inference that is drawn from this account is that there is no necessary original emphasis on the end of the sentence: at first the speaker did no more than fill in a form according to the traditional instructions. It was only with time that the position could become significant. Since the effect of such Latin was of a series of pauses as each verb was reached, the verb at the end grew to be used as a kind of stop, and Virgil, for example, often used this

position to draw attention to the beginning or end of a parenthesis or subordinate episode.

To explain the internal position of the verb, F. shows that many early sentences had loose appendages following the verb. These he explains as examples of final position, because the adverbial or other attachments are not organic parts of the sentence. But the time came when, the appendages having become more important, the sentence with an internal verb can be said to be a unity. The purpose of such a sentence would be, e.g., to emphasize the final phrase by delaying it, or to make a good connection with a following clause. The early tendency of phrases with the verb 'to be' to change their order is also mentioned, but the misquotation of a fragment of Coelius (on page 37) spoils a good contrast with Cato.

The initial verb is explained as leaving its natural place to give some special force either to the subject-matter or to itself or to the rest of the sentence. Various instances are collected: imperatives, words like *nolle*, *posse*, *scire* (often in the first person), verbs describing any remarkable thing such as noise, and verbs attracted to *ut*, *ne*, *si*, and to relative pronouns. This initial position, no less than the final, is found in the earliest literature.

This survey, considered only generally, includes much that is plausible. The details are sometimes less convincing. But in such a subject rigid classification can be obtained only by second sight or by dogmatism based on subjective explanation of Latin texts. How, for example, on F.'s account, is one to draw the line between the final verb with appendages, and the true internal verb?

There is no reference to the works of Marouzeau. The book badly needs an *index locorum*, and an *index rerum* would help the reader to collect, e.g., the many interesting notes on the growth of word-order within the works of Sallust.

J. A. H. WAY.

University of Glasgow.

CICERO PRO ARCHIA AND PRO FLACCO.

Cicéron. *Pour le poète Archias*: texte établi et traduit par F. GAFFIOT. *Pour L. Flaccus*: texte établi et traduit par A. BOULANGER. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 20 fr.

IN this volume, the twelfth in the Budé series of Cicero, M. Gaffiot is responsible for the *Pro Archia*, M. Boulanger for the *Pro Flacco*.

(a) G.'s translation appears wholly admirable. My doubts concern his introduction and his text. He finds in the speech Cicero's 'profession of faith', political as well as oratorical, and believes that the speech was intended to secure for Cicero the position of Laelius to Pompey's Scipio. This seems unnecessarily subtle: would Pompey have been more favourably disposed to Cicero for a service rendered, even indirectly, to the Luculli?

In textual matters G. is a conservative: in this he has, within limits, my support. In the following cases I disagree:—4, *contigit*: G. defends both non-Ciceronian construction and anacoluthon with spirit: but read *condidit* or *coepit*. 6, *L. Lucullo*: the correction M. Lucullo is based on § 8, which is surely decisive. 10, *gravatim civitatem in Graecia*, G.: *gravat in vel gratuito civitatem in Graecia*, MSS. *Gravatim* gives bad sense; and Cicero uses *gravate*. To restore the sense, delete *gravatim*. Can *gravat* be a corrector's comment on an *in* wrongly inserted before *civitatem*? (*Gratis*, pace Reid,

corrects *gravat in*.) 16, *adulescentiam agunt*: "'pousser", "talonner", "activer" la jeunesse', G. Surely impossible: read *alunt*, or *acuunt*.

(b) B.'s text is in the main that of Früchtel; and his introduction is clear and good. His translation shows some blemishes: the following are the most serious:—14, *paterno amico et perneccario*: 'ami très intime de son père'. *qui domi stare non poterant*: 'qui ne pouvaient rester chez eux' (see C.R. LII. 70). 23, *Nam aut oratio testium refelli solet aut vita laedi*: 'de réfuter . . . et de les attaquer'. 33, *Equidem Q. fratris mei laude delector, sed aliis magis gravioribus atque maioribus*: B. translates Müller's *omni*, and neglects *magis*. 41, *magna frequentia conventuque vestro*: 'suivi par une foule immense, tandis que vous teniez séance'. (Is B. translating Naugerius' *consessu*?) 53, *quasi ministrator aderat*: '... comme un assesseur'. 100, *urbana iuris dictio*: 'préture urbaine'. Flaccus was more probably *praetor peregrinus* (thus also B., introd., p. 58). 106, *vel generis vel vetustatis vel hominis causa*: 'par égard pour . . . et pour . . ., aussi bien que pour . . .'

Actual mistranslations apart, there are several cases of inadequate and careless renderings; there are also several misprints. In addition, *turbissimis* (34) is *turbissumis* at 42: 42 has also *acerruma*, and 46 *levissumi*. Why yield to V here?

GEOFFREY PERCIVAL.

University College, Cardiff.

THE FOURTH ECLOGUE AND THE MIRACULOUS CHILD.

Beniamino STUMPO: *Il Fanciullo miracoloso dell' Ecloga IV di Virgilio*. Pp. 111. Amatrice: Tipografia dell' Orfanotrofio Maschile, 1936. Paper, L. 5.

IN this work Stumpo once more argues for an interpretation he proposed in 1903, namely, that the Eclogue is a *carmen genethliacum* in honour of Octavian, composed in 40 or 39 B.C., in which the poet celebrates his benefactor in the form of a prophecy *ex eventu*. No one would deny that the central

part of the Eclogue is in some sense a γενεθλιακόν, or that a few of its phrases (e.g. *facta parentis, Iovis incrementum*) could be interpreted as possible (if not probable) references to Octavian. But if Virgil had Octavian in mind, why did he in effect dedicate the poem to Pollio, the partisan of Antony? To this cardinal difficulty the author devotes only his last page, where he suggests that a satisfactory parallel is afforded by the *Georgics*, dedicated to Maecenas though containing praises of

Octavian. A much sounder defence than this is needed. Furthermore, Stumpo's interpretation compels him to hold that the consulship of Pollio coincides with the manhood of the *puer* (vv. 37-46); but the one thing which seems clear from the difficult sequence of ideas in vv. 4-17 is that it is the conception or birth of the child with which the consulship is closely associated. Many wild suggestions have been made about this poem; but first place must now be taken by Stumpo's opinion (p. 99) that the *dea dignata cubili* of v. 64 is a reference to Octavian's marriage with Scribonia.

In the course of his work Stumpo has some desultory refutations of Norden, Wagenvoort, and Carcopino; he rejects all mystical, Orphic, and Pytha-

gorean interpretations; he discusses the claims of Julia (very cursorily), Marcellus, and the sons of Pollio; but he makes no mention of a child of the marriage of Antony and Octavia, and seems not to know of Tarn's important article in *J.R.S.*, 1932, 135 ff., or Mattingly's in *C.R.*, 1934, 161 ff. Much of the booklet is not directly concerned with the identity of the child but deals with such topics as the Sibylline books and the place of Apollo in the Augustan age; indeed, the best part of the work is the first chapter, in which the alleged parallels between the Eclogue and Isaiah are shrewdly analysed. There are some bad misprints in the Latin citations (e.g. *Sybillini*, *pestilentiae*, *igenii*, *soboles*). J. F. MOUNTFORD.

University of Liverpool.

A STUDY OF JUVENAL.

ENZO V. MARMORALE: *Giovenale*. Pp. 157. Naples: Ricciardi, 1938. Paper, L. 10.

THIS slight but gracefully written book purports to be a solution of 'the Juvenal problem', which according to Mr Marmorale has been solved by nobody before him because it has never been posed in the correct terms. The problem is that of Juvenal's artistic character: are we to consider him a moralist, a declaimer, or a poet?

In chapter I Mr Marmorale examines Juvenal's attitude to moral problems, and concludes that he was not a moralist because his passionate nature and his lack of philosophical training kept him from having a complete ethical system. I do not attach much importance to his strictures on Juvenal's rancorous and indignant character; other violently emotional men, such as Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, have certainly been moralists. But they were trained philosophers, and Mr Marmorale does well to show that Juvenal was not—for we have heard too much of his devotion to moral theory. This first chapter, otherwise carefully wrought, is marred by one dazzling inconsistency. The author accepts and builds upon Juvenal's obviously ironical apologia for writing: 'I write not be-

cause I want to, but simply to pay out all these other writers'; compare the rich Persius in his prologue: 'I write only because my empty belly compels me'. At the same time he rejects Juvenal's soberly advanced and scrupulously followed reason for writing about the dead (I 155), and suggests that 'since he wanted to write at all costs' Juvenal determined to introduce a little novelty into satire, and therefore adopted this 'faintly archaic and humorous tone'. This construction seems to me forced and insipid.

The second chapter is devoted to proving, by a curt examination of each of the satires, that Juvenal was not a poet. What was he, then? He was *un letterato*—a *littérateur*, a lover of fine writing, 'like Lucan and Statius and Tacitus in much of his work'. This interesting classification throws light, not on Juvenal, but on Mr Marmorale. He nowhere adequately formulates or supports his conception of poetry, but it can be reconstructed. He believes that Juvenal's work is not poetry because it 'is addressed to the intellect' rather than the aesthetic sense, because it is full of the 'craze for intellectual discussion', because 'the moralizing trend appears not in images but in conceits', because 'the author constantly

intrudes in person', because it is written *flagrante animo* without the true poetic serenity. From his very rare words of approval we can deduce Mr Marmorale's positive view of poetry: he admires the idyllic description of rural Italy in III 171-9, the brief Lucretian remark on primitive man in VI 11-13, and much of the Messalina passage in VI 116 ff., although he describes the superb phrase *meretrix Augusta* as 'particularly inappropriate'.

Now, verse satire may not be poetry at all. Horace calls his own discourses prosy, which they undoubtedly are; and Juvenal tells the Muses to sit down, *non est cantandum*. But if satire cannot possibly be poetry, Mr Marmorale should have stated and discussed that fact; and then he could have solved 'the Juvenal problem' much more compendiously and instructively by inquiring what Juvenal actually did to satire—did he make it more poetic, or less poetic? and how? What Mr Marmorale has actually done is to apply a set of inappropriate standards to a genus which is essentially intellectual, into which the personality and emotions of the poet must constantly intrude, and which Juvenal (despite his obvious mistakes) did most to raise to the

second rank of high poetry—the rank held, for example, by elegy and comedy.

The third chapter of Mr Marmorale's essay recapitulates the views expressed in the other two, adding a brief survey of the opinions held by some earlier writers on Juvenal. I should perhaps add here that he seems to me to place a wholly false emphasis on Martial's two descriptions of his friend—*facundus*, the vague compliment in VII 91, and *inquietus* in XII 18, which is not a general characteristic at all, but a circumstance closely attached to *errare* in the same line and contrasted with *pigri* in 10. By the way, 'Monico' of Juvenal I 11 was (as his name shows) not a Lapith but a centaur; and Ercole's *Studi Giovenaliani* have by no means 'proved' that satire I was composed last of those in the first book.

On the whole, *Giovenale* will serve as a necessary antidote to the various essays and dissertations which have exaggerated Juvenal's interest in rhetoric and ethical theory; but to our understanding of his place in the history of poetry and of satiric poetry in particular it will contribute very little.

GILBERT HIGHT.

Columbia University, New York.

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE CLASSICAL GREEK RELIGION.

O. KERN: *Die Religion der Griechen*. Dritter Band: Von Platon bis Kaiser Julian. Pp. vii + 352. Berlin: Weidmann, 1938. Paper, RM. 18 (bound, 20).

THIS volume completes the very readable and interesting work which Dr. Kern set himself to write some ten years ago. It is perhaps the least original of the three, for the author, who has too much good sense to wander down bypaths of impossible theory (though some of his own hypotheses are bold enough), is generally content to summarize in an easily understandable way what others have written; or, to speak more exactly, what other Continentals have written, for of British and American literature he has far too little knowledge. This defect he himself apologizes for and regrets (p. 352),

and therefore it need not be stressed. Some part of it is clearly due to the difficulty of getting the relevant works; for example, on p. 248, note 2, he mentions an article of Festugière in *Harv. Theol. Rev.* xxxi, and thanks the author for sending it to him: but the very next page shows that he has seen it only, for he uses the theory of Pfister (*A.R.W.* xxxiv, 42 sqq.) on the relations of the Gospels to Herakles, without knowing my refutation of it, in the same volume of the Harvard periodical. Some deficiencies, therefore, are to be set down to purely external, perhaps economic, causes; they do not bulk very large.

The volume is divided into twelve chapters, treating in order of Greek gods in Italy, philosophy and popular religion, the religion of Alexander the

Great, *Einbruch und Umbruch*, deified men (kings and others), the preliminaries of syncretism, the temples, feasts and mysteries which still subsisted or came into being in the later periods, magic, *Ausklang*, and finally a review of the history of the subject from Aristotle to Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, good if the limitation mentioned in the first paragraph is borne in mind.

One of the greatest virtues of the book is that the general classical reader, who does not pretend to be a specialist on ancient religion, will find here a plain account, very seldom misleading and omitting little that is essential, of much which he has perhaps vaguely seen mentioned elsewhere. Thus, everyone has probably heard of the mysteries of Andania; Kern gives (p. 188 *sqq.*) the main facts,—when they began, what gods were worshipped, where the inscriptional record of them is most easily found, and the titles of some good books, dissertations and articles dealing with them. Pan is a deity who comes into fashion every now and then in non-specialist literature, including fiction; if anyone would know how slight is the connection between modern fancies and anything even late antiquity believed,

there is a good sketch of his original nature and Hellenistic developments on pp. 127-38.

It is a pity that now and then Kern has missed some good recent work published at least near, if not actually in, Germany. It is, for instance, clear from several misunderstandings in his account of Dionysiac ritual (p. 191 *sqq.*) that he is imperfectly informed what *τελετή* means, and would benefit by Zijderfeld's essay which has that word for its title (C.R. XLVII, p. 237). A wider reading of works in his own language or any of several others would perhaps convince him that his assertions about the large share of mystery-religions in the formation of Christianity (e.g., p. 276) are over-confident, and such dicta as that on p. 210, that Reitzenstein's views are the only guide through the maze of this complicated subject, a trifle one-sided. But no one can read everything, and the mass of literature which he has assimilated is imposing.

Altogether, a book whose faults, though real, are easily outweighed by its virtues.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A SKETCH OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.

J. M. TODD: *The Ancient World*. Pp. 416; 23 plates, 7 maps. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938. Cloth, 9s. 6d.

THE mere body of ancient history is impressive in its bulk and has the power of fettering the interest of the student. But we only begin to realize what it really means when 'mens agitat molem', and the limbs begin to live. A vivid realization of this fact is the great and distinctive merit of Mr. Todd's book. To him it is the idea of an age that really matters; it is according to the truth and force of these ideas that he assigns space and emphasis. The result is a book, not perfected proportionally on purely theoretical principles, but coherent in itself and true to its own spirit—a book that is a joy to read, as it surely was to write.

It is inevitable and right that, in

a book based so much on quality, the Greeks should take up a very large share of our attention. The intellectual curiosity that characterized the Greek race, its bold experimentalism, its fertility in political devices, are all brought home to us. The wonder of the great age of Greece comes back to us again as realized by yet one more observer. Perhaps, in dealing with political history, it would be right to balance the praise by severer condemnation of the political failure of the Greeks. For the failure was not political only; it derived from moral weakness and it hazarded the survival of the best of Greek culture. Similarly, the great positive contribution of Rome to world-history—her strong instinct for the building and governing of a state, developed through long centuries of discipline and training—deserves more attention than it receives. Rome had

her own idea, as potent as that of Greece, if less rich and varied. Had she not had it, Greek culture, as we know it, could hardly have survived. We are debtors to both Greek and Roman. So too the special student of Babylon or Egypt may feel that the spiritual values carried by these two countries are only imperfectly rendered. No civilization can survive for centuries without some powerful internal impulse to animate it. In the case of Greece, the impulse is peculiarly easy to realize and peculiarly attractive. But in other cases it is worth looking for, for it is always the key to understanding.

Mr. Todd has deliberately given a larger place to religions—in particular, to Judaism and Christianity—than is usual in a general history. He justifies his method by its success, for he convinces us that in these religious movements lay much of the significance of the times. One fruitful theme that he suggests—Christianity as the soul of an

Empire, in danger of being lost in its own material bulk—might well be developed. The new soul and the old body could never quite agree, and therein lies one cause of the fall of Rome.

The reader of Mr. Todd's book is hardly likely to escape from him without catching the infection of his enthusiasm. The illustrations are interesting and of good quality, but it is probably just to say that here they are definitely secondary: the kindling of interest is through the written record rather than through the bones of the past. The style is vigorous and rapid: an occasional blemish, such as 'sphericity', surprises one by its infrequency. Even a seasoned hack of a reviewer is stirred to enthusiasm by the freshness and keenness of Mr. Todd's work and commends it to the reader in search of enjoyable instruction with more than the usual warmth and confidence.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

SOLON THE LIBERATOR.

W. J. WOODHOUSE: *Solon the Liberator*. A study of the agrarian problem in Attika in the seventh century. Pp. xvii + 218. London: Milford, 1938. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS volume is the last major contribution of the late Professor Woodhouse to classical scholarship. Its author died without revising the proofs, and the work is now published with a biographical note by Professor Angus and a list of the author's previous publications. Together with unfinished work which may yet be edited we have from Professor Woodhouse a corpus of research which amply fulfils his wish 'to leave some memorial to the honour and glory of letters'.

The work under review is produced with the high accuracy that we expect from the Oxford University Press, but is not entirely free from small blemishes. There is some inconsistency in spelling; there is no index; the bibliography is full and valuable but unwinnowed,¹ and

there is some apparent contradiction in its divagant logical scheme.

Woodhouse's argument, while owing much to de Coulanges and Guiraud, is on the whole adversely critical of the orthodox tradition represented, with modifications, by Bury, Swoboda, and Adcock. In his introductory chapters he examines the literary evidence, the vague Solon, the muddled Aristotle, and the obscure Plutarch. He then isolates for discussion the Hektemors, and concludes that their grievances were rooted in the mere fact of their status, that of ruined free labourers who had surrendered themselves and their households to powerful landowners in perpetuity, in return for one-sixth of their product. He next examines the general economic distress in the seventh century and postulates an inalienability of family estate, sold under duress with the option of redemption—a form of disposal which he thinks was expressly invented at that time for pledging tied family estate. By this process possession but not ownership was transferred, and as records of these contracts there were set

¹ Hasebroek's *Staat u. Handel* in its English translation by Fraser and Macgregor is ascribed to Wade-Gery.

up Horoi, not boundary- but ward-stones. Solon's achievement was to liberate the enslaved human pledges and to free the land of all secured indebtedness.

Woodhouse has worked out this argument and related topics in detail and with great precision. He is particularly sound in his criticism of his predecessors. His own thesis, which, given the scanty evidence, cannot admit of conclusive proof, has in it much that is plausible and attractive, in spite of his cavalier dismissal of inconvenient tags from Hesiod and Isocrates and an inevitable reliance on largely fourth-century authorities for the form of modified sale. Its weakness, granting the premises, is that the economic conditions it envisages seem remote from reality. We know, for instance, of a 'selling' of land which conveys mere possession, but it is not easy to imagine a 'selling' of human beings outside of Attica that transferred anything short of downright ownership. It is however in his premises that Woodhouse is most vulnerable. He assumes arbitrarily that rent was unimportant as a factor in distress, that Hektemors could hardly fall into debt and were outside the prevalent distress, that 'agrarian' indebtedness is essentially different from 'commercial' indebtedness. He does not clearly show wherein lay

Solon's lasting achievement if liberated peasants were straightway free to re-mortgage estate on terms which, while precluding enslavement, exposed their all to irrevocable alienation. Indeed it is difficult to see, on Woodhouse's premises, how distress ever arose or was substantially alleviated. The agrarian problem cannot be isolated in this way. It is true, he has devoted a chapter to the grounds for discontent and has re-stated the traditional account of the effects of the introduction of coinage, but his reasons do not convince. There is here a general disregard of the problems of money and an airy Hasebroekian minimizing of the extent of trade. It is to be regretted that the author, instead of deprecating petulant queries about his exclusion of the topic money and coinage (xv), did not bring to that subject the same acumen and verve with which he has tackled his self-delimited theme. However, though his conclusions are controversial his method is stimulating and his every page full of interest and value. This is a work of the first importance, not only as a contribution to our knowledge of Solon but as an addition to the all-too-slowly growing body of monographs necessary as a foundation for an economic history of ancient Greece.

W. J. SARTAIN.

Selwyn College, Cambridge.

DURA-EUPOPOS AND ITS ART.

M. ROSTOVITZEFF: *Dura-Europos and its Art*. Pp. xiv + 162; 12 text figures, 28 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 15s.

THE excavation of Dura-Europos, which stands on the middle Euphrates in what is now Syrian territory, began fifteen years ago. Several long Preliminary Reports have appeared, and Professor Rostovtzeff, who has supervised the work since 1928, has given us a short account in *Caravan Cities*. The present book, the substance of lectures given in 1937, contains much unpublished material. Frequent cross-references in the text refer the student to valuable detailed notes, chiefly references to the Reports and to other sources, and there is an adequate index.

Little of the pre-Hellenistic native village has survived. The Hellenistic city was founded about 300 B.C. and was perhaps the capital of the Seleucid satrapy of Parapotamia. Comparatively little of this period remains; the city was built on the Hippodamian plan, and most of the surviving buildings are in Greek style. The Parthians, who occupied the city about 140 B.C., did not alter its administrative status, and the outward appearance of the city was not much changed in the first hundred years of Parthian rule. Rostovtzeff has shown in *Caravan Cities* how the pact between Augustus and Parthia made safe the westbound caravan trade across the Syrian Desert by way of the neutral state of Palmyra,

which became very prosperous. Dura benefited greatly by this agreement, and was probably more or less autonomous for most of the next two hundred years. There was great building activity, religious and secular, and the city lost its Greek appearance and became outwardly and inwardly an Oriental city. A sky-god and a fertility-goddess were worshipped under both Greek and Semitic names in temples of a Mesopotamian-Syrian type. The art of the religious paintings, for which Dura is so important, is probably a conscious reaction against the leading principles of Greek art. It would be misleading to call it Parthian, for Iranian elements are only secondary, and the author prefers the label 'Mesopotamian.' The ruling class continued to take pride in its alleged descent from the original Macedonian colonists, and the official cult of Seleucus Nicator and his patron gods survived. Trajan occupied Dura and built a triumphal arch, but the city was soon evacuated, perhaps before his death. It was finally annexed to Rome in 165 A.D. Septimius Severus and Caracalla once more took up an aggressive policy towards Parthia, and under them one quarter of the whole area of Dura was enclosed for a camp for the Roman garrison.

About this period a small Christian church and a synagogue were built. The weakened Parthian dynasty fell to the Sassanian princes of South Iran, who finally took and sacked Dura about 260 A.D. Its fifty years as a Roman military colony, cut off from the caravan trade on which it lived, had been years of impoverishment and decay.

The present reviewer feels that the long comparative study of the important synagogue frescoes in Chapter IV, desirable enough in a monograph, is out of proportion to the scope of this book, and regrets that the author did not save himself a few pages to tell us something of the everyday life of the city and its common objects and processes. The author, rather than the compositor and the proof-reader, seems to be responsible for a few peculiarities of vocabulary and spelling. Seven out of ten maps and plans have no scale and five have no north-point. These however are but superficial blemishes. Scholars will welcome the book as an attractive *hors d'œuvre* to the forthcoming Preliminary Reports, themselves the *entrée* to the sumptuous Final Report for which, it is to be hoped, we shall not have to wait too long.

G. E. KIRK.

HOUSES AT OLYNTHUS.

Excavations at Olynthus. Part VIII. The Hellenic House. A study of the houses found at Olynthus, with a detailed account of those excavated in 1931 and 1934. By D. M. ROBINSON and J. W. GRAHAM. Pp. xxii + 370; 111 plates, 36 figs. in text. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 67s. 6d.

FOR his new volume on the results of his excavations at Olynthus Professor Robinson has been fortunate in securing the collaboration of Dr. Graham, whose unpublished dissertation on *Domestic Architecture in Classical Greece* is incorporated. This was a detailed study of the Hellenic house based on those excavated at Olynthus in 1931 and 1934, in both of which years Dr. Graham took part in the work. Consequently

this book is much more than an excavation report and discusses the Greek town house in general.

That the Myriophyto site is Olynthus can hardly now be seriously doubted by anyone. The debatable question whether the city was reoccupied after its capture by Philip II in 348 B.C. is discussed by the authors, and it is noted that the evidence of coins found in 1934 seems to indicate that there was some reoccupation of the north hill after 348 and down to the foundation of Kassandreia in 316-5. The north hill houses themselves are to be dated, according to the authors, between about 432 and 348 B.C. It does not appear from this report that the usual methods, wall analysis and the examination of foundation trenches, for dating walls and buildings were tried. Archaeological

evidence of this kind, if obtainable, would be especially valuable at this site.

The plans and illustrations, both photographs and drawings, are good, and Dr. Graham's reconstructions deserve special commendation. The north hill houses at Olynthus are uniformly laid out in *insulae* between straight streets in agreement with the ideas attributed to Hippodamus. The houses themselves, obviously those of 'a good class residential district', as the mosaic floors testify, though they conform to a general type, were not 'ribbon-built' and do not continually repeat the same plan. On the south hill, probably a poorer and perhaps an older quarter, the houses are smaller and simpler.

The house plan generally is of the *pastas* type, and indications of the evolution from *pastas* to peristyle are visible. Thus they are typologically earlier than those at Delos, where the peristyle is fully evolved and only traces of the earlier *pastas* type can be discerned. At Delos the irregularity of the streets and *insulae* is in strong contrast to Olynthus. Structurally there is a difference, due no doubt to the materials available. At Delos the walls of the lower floor are built of packed stone, whereas at Olynthus except for a stone base the whole house was of crude brick—*adobe*, to use the Spanish-

American word — strengthened with timber framework. Of these and all other details the book provides a careful survey with constant mention of pertinent literary evidence and also of Greek houses found elsewhere. It is thus a useful work of reference for questions connected with the Greek house, its plan, its structure, and its equipment, which, however, at Olynthus was rather scanty owing probably to looting after the capture of the city.

It is always difficult to name with certainty the various rooms of a house. Of the identifications proposed here the only one which seems somewhat dubious is that of the flue. The room with a hearth can reasonably have been a kitchen, but the flues adjoining seem disproportionately large. The question is best left *sub iudice*. The suggestion that the large open space in *insulae* A i-iv may have been a parade ground is not convincing. The *andron* at Corinth mentioned on p. 179 does not seem a very good example, for 'only part of the floor is preserved and no traces of walls'. As regards locks, Dawkins' notes on modern Greek locks in *B.S.A.* IX, p. 190 ff. might have been cited. An appendix gives the more important objects found in the houses cleared in 1931 and 1934.

A. J. B. WACE.

Cambridge.

ROMAN THINKERS AND THE ROMAN STATE.

O. SEEL: *Römische Denker und römischer Staat*. Pp. v+98. (Neue Wege zur Antike, I. Reihe, Heft 13.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 3.90.

THIS volume consists of a series of essays on representative Roman writers of the Gold and Silver Ages, whose underlying philosophies are here analysed and brought into view.

The essays on Cicero the Illusionist, on Virgil the Mystic, and on Sallust the Incurable Republican, are comparatively brief. Two more searching studies are devoted to Horace and Tacitus, whom Seel regards as repositories of two archetypal Roman traits, uncompromising sincerity and unques-

tioning belief in Rome's mission to conquer.

We may well agree with Seel in holding that Horace's attitude of candid friendship to Augustus was a belated example of the old Roman forthrightness; but we may doubt whether the poet's chauvinism was more typically Roman than the opportunism of the emperor.

Seel shows a particularly keen interest in Tacitus. He rightly recognizes that Tacitus sighed for the Republic, not because of its antiquated constitutional mechanism, but because it stood for the basic Roman virtue, *Romana fides*, and that if he felt his own times out of joint, the reason was that this virtue

was disappearing (or should we say, was less visible on the surface?) under the régime of the Caesars. He makes another good point when he insists that Tacitus was not primarily a biographer or a portraitist, and that, far from conceiving the emperors as the poles round which the world revolved, he regarded them as the playthings of Fate.

Seel enters on more debatable ground when he contends that Tacitus was undramatic in his technique. He argues that the historian, contrary to the practice of any competent playwright, keeps his readers fully posted up and explains everything. But, to say the least, Tacitus does not take his readers into his full confidence like Thucydides, Polybius, or even Caesar. One might go further and point out (as has recently been made clear by the American scholars Marsh and Rogers) that

Tacitus' masterpiece of misrepresentation, his consummate caricature of Tiberius, is largely the product of a wilful economy of truth; his technique of illumination and obscuration might be said to betray an expert stage-hand.

Seel's final chapter, in which he endeavours to link his Roman writers to their Greek mentors in philosophy, is, of necessity, more suggestive than convincing. In view of the fact that most Greek philosophers survive only in excerpts, and that Roman authors took sips from Greek philosophy but did not wallow in it, it is seldom possible to trace their borrowings with any degree of certainty.

Seel writes in a recondite style which non-German readers may find difficult. But his book is a product of hard and independent thinking, and will therefore repay study.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROMAN COINAGE.

The Development of Roman Coinage. By J. G. MILNE. Pp. 22. Oxford: Blackwell, 1937. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

THIS short survey of the development of Roman coinage by a distinguished Greek numismatist has two special and notable advantages. It approaches the subject from a rather unusual angle and, in so doing, is unusually successful in exhibiting Roman coinage in its setting in geography and history. It does not simply echo the views given in any one text-book: though probably influenced by the research of the last few years, it is essentially an individual and independent statement.

Dr. Milne's plan has been to show how Rome, advancing very late to coinage from the Italian currency of rude bronze, first established a coinage on a bronze standard, was then led by exigencies of war and financial stress to reduce its weight, and, finally, crossed over to the famous silver standard of the *denarius*. With the general treatment of this theme we have no fault at all to find and can only congratulate the author on a very confident and persuasive piece of exposition.

When we look closer into details, however, some doubts suggest them-

selves. Is it possible that the Etruscan *aes grave* is as early as Dr. Milne is inclined to place it? And can we use weight quite so unreservedly as a criterion of date? Where is the drop of weight in the *aes grave* of Hatria mentioned on p. 11? The abandonment of the traditional date of the *denarius*, 269 B.C., is surely right, but what can really be said in favour of Dr. Milne's own date, 217 B.C.? The passage in Pliny which he refers to the *denarius* is certainly concerned, as it now stands, with a gold coin. Dr. Milne is really postulating a very extensive disturbance of text or meaning in Pliny. The attribution of a value of 16 *asses* to the *quadrigatus*, not the *denarius*, in 217 B.C. is a very ingenious device, which has occurred independently to other students: but Pliny's evidence is probably a mere false dating of the real change of tariff, at a much later date, of the *denarius*. Dr. Milne thinks that the original name of the *denarius* was *bigatus*. The booty-lists from Spain, if read in association with his dating, fit in very well with this view: but it is much more probable, either that Livy did not mean by *bigatus* or *argentum Oscense*

what we are inclined to mean by them today, or that he is importing later terms into an earlier context. The original meaning of *bigatus* was, almost certainly, 'half *quadrigatus*' by an amusing play on words: what is half a *quadriga*? Why, a *biga*, of course.

These and other points will long continue to furnish a battle-ground for specialists. The doubts that we have suggested do not greatly affect the value of Dr. Milne's work of interpretation.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

RULERS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

W. WEBER: *Rom. Herrschertum und Reich im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Pp. viii+409; 11 plates, 3 maps. Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1937. Paper, RM. 7.80 (bound, 9.60).

THIS volume comes into the world not in utter novelty but conveying the substance of an earlier incarnation. Five long chapters narrate a century of imperial history, apportioned between the five rulers from Trajan to Commodus. Only the first of them will be quite new to English readers—Trajan, and he is a second version of Professor Weber's chapter in *Meister der Politik* (III¹, 1923, 39 ff. = I², 199 ff.). Hadrian, Pius, M. Aurelius and Commodus represent an expansion of two chapters in the eleventh volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Not only that: Hadrian, like Trajan, had previously made his *début* in *Meister der Politik* (a fact nowhere revealed in *C.A.H.* XI). Three lives is a lot, even for the most Protean of emperors.

Bulk for bulk, the relevant chapters are here about twice as long as in *C.A.H.* XI. The increase is not due to documentation added here because elsewhere curtailed by editorial command. That would have been valuable, as most of the evidence for the period is fragmentary and equivocal. Instead, Weber has placed his narrative 'auf eine breitere Basis'. The choice of this procedure is the author's own affair: its value might be debated.

That Professor Weber in the writing of history should have chosen an individual style is all to the good. The moving record of men and states should avoid, if it can, both the narrow compression of a book of reference and the wide and woolly expanses of political or hortatory journalism. Weber, however, in zeal to shun the pedestrian, plunges right off the road. A character in one of

Peacock's novels confesses to a strong partiality for that which is 'exquisitely dusky and fuliginous'. Weber seems possessed by a holy horror of clear statement and hard fact, all through, from the beginning down to the ultimate and apocalyptic figure of Commodus, the 'Spanish visionary, mystical, handsome, pliant, strong' (*C.A.H.* XI, p. 392). Prose-style and conception of history run hand in hand—not for nothing is Weber the author of *Der Prophet und sein Gott*, a mystical and dithyrambic work. He has 'trafficked for strange webs with eastern merchants'. They appear to have driven a pretty hard bargain.

In any case, it is an arduous enough task to write Antonine history: how it should best be done is by no means obvious. Weber works with a synthesis between Graeco-Oriental religious beliefs and imperial biography. But 'religiöse Strömungen' are not everything, and preoccupation with individual emperors, even when it does not succumb to the conventional and vicious antithesis between 'good' and 'bad', is yet a distortion of historical perspective. The personality of a ruler may be quite inscrutable; it may be a schematic construction of official propaganda; or it may be of no importance whatever. A great secret was once let out, we are told, when it was first revealed that an emperor could be made elsewhere than at Rome. Another of the *arcana imperii* was more jealously guarded—it did not matter so much who was emperor: a system had been constructed, the machine goes on. It is precisely in the period of the Antonines that the significance of the individual ruler declines steadily (*cf.* A. Alföldi, *J.R.S.*, 1937, 254 ff.).

These emperors come from the pro-

vinces. That is a fact of some moment. How is it to be interpreted? Weber lays all the emphasis upon their remotest race and ancestry, recorded or conjectural, on blood and soil, air and water. 'Hadrian's strength was born of the mingling in him of old-Italian and Iberian and perhaps African-Semitic blood; the ocean, the plain, now luxuriant now sun-stricken, and the sluggish river of the south-western edge of the empire left their mark on his family and his childhood' (*C.A.H.* XI, p. 325 = approximately p. 229 here). Yet Trajan as well as Hadrian came from Italica in the province of Baetica; very different types of men, one would imagine. Is the difference then due to a sinister strain of 'African-Semitic blood' in Hadrian? For his father married a woman of Gades. Again, the 'Spaniard' Trajan has much in common with the Narbonensian Agricola, who, like him, was 'capax imperii'. Weber's way of looking at

these things neglects the essentials, namely training, Roman nationality and social standing.

But it would take too long to discuss the fascinating topic of the oligarchy of government according to its origin and composition. In general all through this book the choice of facts, in point of relevance or veracity, is not always of the happiest. Too much importance is assigned to the evidence of the *Historia Augusta* and of coins. Inscriptions suffer undue neglect. For example, coin-legends conventional and official, if not downright mendacious, are quoted as evidence for British history in the last years of Antoninus Pius: not a word of the inscription which shows that the legions had to be strengthened by special drafts from the Continent. A small point, perhaps, and parochial. But it is symptomatic and disquieting.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

THE CONCEPTION OF ROME.

Roma nell' Opera del Genio. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1937-8.

THESE seven lectures,¹ with two others on Rome in the works of Goethe and Leopardi, formed a course given at the Institute of Roman Studies on Rome as conceived by men of genius. The Institute is not primarily a scientific one, but devotes itself rather to propaganda and popular culture for strangely assorted audiences. The free lecture, as once the recitation, is a perennial diversion of the Romans, especially when primed with patriotic fervour. Within a framework of often exaggerated nationalism, there is much sound sense and learning in these lectures, but taken as a whole they suffer from a confusion of ideas. All the different conceptions of Rome, whether as place or idea, whether the idea of the spiritual or cultural or political (imperial or republican) unity of Italy or Europe or Christendom or the world, are felt to have been 'by genius' 'infallibly' prophesied and realized all at once in the Italy and

Rome of Mussolini. But it is never asked whether these ideas are compatible, nor whether the vision of a poet can be simply equated with a work of history or a political programme. Can Rome both have already civilized the world and still have the work to do again?

In Senator Formichi's treatment of Shakespeare, the function of poetry and the life and mind of the poet could scarcely be worse misconceived, nor the causes of the distortion be more patent. The proof that Shakespeare had a profound knowledge of Latin, and from his boyhood an imperialist's enthusiasm for Rome, is magnificent. In dealing with Corneille, Dr. Bellonci shows greater restraint as well as knowledge, and so cannot conceal from himself the artificiality of making a poet's 'matter' essential, his ideas and culture secondary, and he gives up the attempt to prove the 'romanity' of Racine. His account of Carducci is admirable, though a foreigner can scarcely feel like an Italian about the 'eternal barbarians beyond the frontiers'. Senator Ores-

¹ For particulars see *C.R.* LII. 160.

tano ably traces the development of Vico's ideas, and wisely refrains from discussing what Vico meant by 'heroic'.

In Petrarch Professor Marpicati has a good, if not a new, story to tell. But Petrarch's Latin poem *Africa* is scarcely his best and most important work, even if the 'coincidence of great situations' (Scipio's return from Africa and Bado-glio's from Abyssinia) makes it politically alive. Professor Bruers' study of Gioberti as the anticipator of the Lat-eran pact is clear and interesting, but it

is in D'Annunzio that he naturally finds the prophet of the Fascist Revolution and of its Leader, and he selects passages in prose and verse where D'Annunzio's powers of evocation are at their most magnificent. But it is a magnificence which is surely unroman, uneuropean and unchristian, and can find its realization as a political programme only in the flamboyant violence and romantic glory of war.

C. G. HARDIE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

THE APE IN ANTIQUITY.

W. C. McDERMOTT: *The Ape in Antiquity*. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 27.) Pp. vii+338; 10 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

ONE half of this book consists of a catalogue of monkeys figured in ancient art, of all sorts and sizes, from little terra-cotta figurines to the mosaics of Palestrina and Pompeii; Egyptian art is treated slightly, but Etruscan and Minoan things are dealt with faithfully. Some six hundred objects are briefly catalogued and described, but 'in most cases it was necessary to depend on published material', and the treatment is therefore neither original nor exhaustive. There are ten plates, all interesting and some beautiful, especially a young Orpheus with lute and listeners, from Sabrata in Tripoli; an Egyptian terra-cotta from Berlin, of Hellenistic age, is said to represent a Gorilla with her two young, but this identification is far short of convincing.

The other half deals with apes and monkeys in ancient literature, and there is very little, if indeed there be anything of the least importance, which Dr. McDermott has left out of his reckoning. The various apes are sometimes easy, but oftener difficult, to identify. There is no mystery about that showman's pet, the common Barbary Ape, the *simia* or *πίθηκος*; but

whether Hanno saw Gorillas or only Chimpanzees on that island off the Guinea coast is a hard and a long-disputed question. A minor difficulty is the so-called *χοιροπίθηκος*, mentioned once and once only (if at all) by Aristotle, and seemingly, but by no means certainly, confirmed by the Palestrina mosaic. 'Neque est cur miremur' (as Lichtenstein said a hundred and fifty years ago) 'scriptores, qui nostro aevo de historia naturali memoriae pro-diderunt, vago errore adductos, nunc hunc nunc illum papionem pro Choe-ropitheco Aristotelis venditasse'; but after all it well may be that two words have blundered into one, and that Aristotle was merely telling how the Chameleon has a face like a pig's and a tail like a monkey's. When Pythagoras (the Geographer) described a certain monkey as 'so brilliantly coloured that it was named *κήπος*, a garden', it looks like an understatement (*μείωσις*) to add that 'this is probably a false etymology'. One trifle more. I do not think that 'the only sacred ape in Egypt was the dog-headed baboon, *P. Hamadryas*', even though 'Ehrenberg seems to have conclusively demonstrated this'. For Ehrenberg wrote a hundred years ago, and M. V. Loret has found both Hamadryad and Anubis baboons un-mistakably mummied in the Valley of the Kings.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

IN HONOUR OF WILHELM HERAEUS.

W. HERAEUS: *Kleine Schriften*, zum 75. Geburtstag . . . ausgewählt und herausgegeben von J. B. Hofmann. Pp. xvi + 267. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, III. Abt., 17.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, M. 19.50 (bound, 22).

DURING the last fifty years few pens have been as active as that of Wilhelm Heraeus in the fields of Lexicography, Glossology and Vulgar Latin. In the midst of many other activities he has found time to produce a steady stream of articles, some of which are of the first importance for their subjects. To celebrate the author's seventy-fifth birthday a number of these articles have been selected and, with the financial assistance of well-wishers, published in book form. No happier tribute to a long life of scholarship can be imagined, and all scholars will be grateful to E. Löfstedt for the initial suggestion, and to J. B. Hofmann for the editorial devotion, to which we owe the present volume.

The choice of articles is representative of Heraeus' interests. He has made a lifelong study of Petronius, and one is glad to see reprinted (with additional annotation) his important Programm of 1899, *Die Sprache des P. u. die Glossen*. We welcome also *Zum Edictum Diocletiani* (Jbb. kl. Ph. 155, 1897), in which he employed the bilingual glossaries so successfully to elucidate many of the puzzling items in that document. His interest in the colloquial aspects of Latin is represented by *Die Sprache der römischen Kinderstube* (A.L.L. 13, 1903). To these and to all the other articles here republished the author has added numerous notes to bring them into connection with his own subsequent researches or with those of others. To the old material there have been added a new and important article entitled *Neue Studien zum Maximallarif Diokletians*, and another in continuation of his article *Zur römischen Soldatensprache* in A.L.L. 12, 1901.

Of scholarly achievements there is none quite so piquant as the successful solution of a textual problem that has baffled previous investigators. Many instances in the present volume illustrate H.'s remarkable gift of emendation and reconstruction. In *Lateinische*

Gedichte auf Inschriften (Hermes 48, 1913) he gave a dexterous twist to a seemingly hopeless African inscription and it emerged as two lines of Martial. In ΠΡΟΠΙΕΙΝ (Rh. M. 70, 1915) he restored the word *propin* in Petron. 28, 3 and in Martial 12, 82 as well as (less convincingly) in two inscriptions. In a new fragment of the Act. fr. Arv. he found the word *sangunculus* and realized that this was the key to the *saucunculum* of Petron. 66, 2 (*Zu P. u. den neuen Arvalakten-Fragmenten*, Rh. M. 72, 1918). His most ingenious effort (*Ein makkaronisches Ovidfragment bei Quintilian*, Rh. M. 79, 1930) was reserved for the obscure passage in Quint. VIII. 6, 33, where he explained one part of that apparently impossible sentence as *Ovidius ioco cludit vino<eo> bono*, being able to reinforce his argument by referring to exactly the same phrase in Greek dress (οὐννοιο βόνοιο) in a macaronic poem of Ausonius. The emendation has been adopted by Radermacher in the new Teubner edition.

Occasionally one ventures to disagree. His derivation of *sarracum* (p. 9) from *σαράραρον*, whatever the explanation of the latter may be, does not take account of the likelihood that *serracum* was the older form. Celtic borrowing seems still the most likely explanation. *Peciolus* (p. 29) is undoubtedly a diminutive of *pes*, but if syncope from **ped(i)ciolus* is the whole explanation the persistent spelling with one *c* presents a problem. The influence of *pecullus* (p. 28) is hardly sufficient if the latter is a late word and *peciolus* an old one. One wonders also if in the Praefatio of the Edict his assumption of a word **ἐπιτιμωμή* (= Zustand der Teuerung = *ἐπιτιμωσις*) will be justified or disproved by the discovery of another fragment. In general one can only admire the sureness with which he handles his detail and the mastery he displays of both Greek and Latin vocabulary. Many scholars besides those whose names appear in the Tabula Gratulatoria will welcome this volume as a tribute to one whose contribution to learning (in fields beyond those here represented) has been so extensive and valuable.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

ARNOLD-BRADLEY-MOUNTFORD.

'Bradley's Arnold': *Latin Prose Composition*. Edited and revised by J. F. MOUNTFORD. Pp. xi + 443. London: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, 7s.

'BRADLEY'S ARNOLD', the 'Coke upon Lyttelton' of our Latin school-studies, required and deserved revision; and in the difficult task of correcting, adding, and adjusting, Dr. Mountford earns sympathy and praise. He has retained Bradley's order of treatment, and only slightly changed the exercises, unattractive though they often are; but much has been re-written, e.g. on verbs of fearing, *cum*-clauses, conditional sentences; and there are frequent changes elsewhere, 'representing a considerable modification of the attitude to grammatical phenomena which was current when the book was first written'. The reader will form a favourable impression if, for example, he compares the revised and unrevised sections on *se* and *suus*, where much that Bradley left hazy is cleared up. The passages for continuous prose, a new feature, are excellently chosen.

In several details, however, Dr. Mountford is disappointing. Confiding in Bradley's usual accuracy, he allows the precept to remain (§ 52) that ambiguous expressions must be avoided; that, while we write *boni* for 'the well-affected', 'of the well-affected' must be *bonorum hominum*. In Merguet's *Lexikon* to Cicero's speeches one finds several instances of *virorum bonorum*; forty of plain, unaccompanied *bonorum*; but of *bonorum hominum* not one.

Take, again, *possum* in conditional sentences (§ 461). Bradley regarded such a sentence as *delevi totus exercitus potuit si fugientes persecuti victores essent* (Liv. 32. 12. 6) as normative for all Latin prose teaching ('the indicative is regularly used'). In this he followed the best authorities of the time. But Priem's article on 'Bedingungssätze', in *Philologus* Supp. 1889, changed all that. His lists showed that in 'unreal' conditional periods (i.e. with protasis fully expressed) the figures for Cicero were these: referring to present time, *possem*, -es, etc. 42 instances, *poteram* 3; referring to past time, *potuissem* 32, *potui*

(or *poteram*) 21. Blase, Menge, Kühner-Stegmann, and Hofmann all note and emphasize the point. Our reviser leaves things where they were in 1881; and to the teachers and examiners who rely on this work *potuissem* and *possem* will still be anathema.

Are not the reviser's embargoes too peremptory, and is he not too stingy with his information? Bradley was more generous. The pupil is allowed to use *volo*, etc. with accusative and infinitive only when the subject of the infinitive is different from that of the main verb. But Cicero, in about twenty passages of his speeches, wrote things like *volo me censorem esse, voluit se nominari*. One begins to read a cryptic or cynical meaning into the reviser's words on p. 308: 'More can be learned by the patient reading of authors such as Cicero and Livy than can be taught by any number of hints'. Why not give full information that *licet* can have *nobis quietos esse* as well as *nobis quietis esse*; and that *puero cognomen Iulus additur* (or *est*) is in Cicero a commoner type of expression than that with *Iulo*? In § 395 (iii) room might be left for the possible (though uncommon) *armorum capiendorum*. Aspiring pupils and inexperienced teachers desire exact guidance on these matters, and as is remarked in the Preface 'many students derive more of their knowledge of Latin Syntax from a book on composition than from a formal grammar'.

In § 143 a more prominent place might be given to the use of the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, and attention might be called to *nihil expectaveris, numquam putaveris, nullum proelium timueris, neminem dederis*, as perfectly regular expressions. In § 352 (end) the examples do not illustrate the exact point that *propter se*, etc. can be used with reference merely to the nearest word: better some instance like *anicum ipsum per se amo*. So too in § 495 the subjunctives *servias* and *propulse* might be hortative: better an instance like *omnia potius perpetiebantur quam arcem traderent*. Room might have been found in §§ 355 f. for a mention of *me ipse consolor* and *se ipse occidit*,

and what they imply. In § 345 we read 'A demonstrative pronoun is not qualified in Latin by a possessive genitive', a rule which would exclude *notum illud Catonis*, and *haec aurium* (Cic. *Tusc.* 4. 20) sc. *voluptas*: why not write 'the demonstrative pronoun is'? There is some carelessness in § 259 in sifting out datives of purpose and predicative datives: for *auxilio* and *subsidio* are surely the latter, whether they are used with *esse* or with *mittere*; and *eligo* is not used like *verto* (*vitio*) with a predicative dative but with *locum* and such datives of purpose as *domicilio*, *pugnae*, *conloquio*.

'Coincident' *cum*-clauses should not have been entirely omitted. The discussion of *cum . . . tum* in § 435 is vitiated by the belief that the *prior time* of the *cum*-clause has something to do with the subjunctive mood of the verb—the Hoffmann notion which Lebreton

Cic. 338 ff. disproved and Kühner-Stegmann ii. 2. 350 utterly rejects. The treatment of consecutive *qui*-clauses in §§ 502-4 is unskilful and pleonastic: there is only a single point illustrated in all three sections, namely that *is qui* can mean 'such as', 'the sort of man who', 'one that'. In § 505 or 507 the use of consecutive *qui*-clauses beside adjectives (*durus homo atque odio qui posset vincere Regem*) clamours for mention. As for the so-called predicative gerundive after *curo*, *do*, *trado* (§ 400), Dr. Mountford borrows from Kennedy's *Revised Latin Primer* the bare account that it indicates that 'something is caused to be done'. This may perhaps suit *curo*, but hardly *trado*. Many would have welcomed such an explanation as is given in Lane's *Latin Grammar*, § 2250.

R. G. NISBET.

University of Glasgow.

SOME SCHOOL-BOOKS.

Alpha Classics. (1) Caesar's *Invasions of Britain*; (2) Cicero's *Speeches for Marcellus and Ligarius*; (3) Euripides' *Hecuba*; (4) Livy, *Book V*; (5) Vergil's *Aeneid III*; (6) Vergil's *Aeneid IX*; (7) Xenophon's *Anabasis II*. Edited by (1) R. C. Carrington, (2) J. Paterson, (3) F. W. King, (4) J. E. Pickstone, (5) R. W. Moore, (6) B. Tilly, (7) R. E. Snaith. Pp. xi + 118, viii + 144, viii + 162, viii + 196, xi + 105, viii + 109, viii + 134; illustrations. London: Bell, 1938. Cloth, (1, 2, 4-7) 2s. each, (3) 2s. 6d.

THIS new series of editions of the classics for use in schools is under the general editorship of Dr. R. C. Carrington. The editor of each volume appears to have been given a free hand within reasonable limits, and there is a refreshing variety of approach: the hand of the general editor might sometimes, however, have been usefully employed in ensuring uniformity in matter of fact. Thus, Mr. Moore dates the *Battle of Philippi* in 42 B.C., Miss Tilly in 41 B.C.; while Miss Tilly sends Vergil to Greece in 19 B.C., whereas Mr. Moore says 'in 20 B.C. he was

travelling in Greece'. Apart, however, from discrepancies and blemishes such as these and from some misprints, wrong accents and faulty breathings, there is much to praise in these volumes, which should be sure of a welcome from teachers.

Each volume presents the Oxford text of the author, with an introduction, notes and vocabulary, as well as twelve illustrations and in some cases one or more maps and plans. The price is most reasonable, the print and binding good, and the lay-out of the notes convenient and not unattractive to the eye. The illustrations are in each case placed together near the beginning of the volume, and are extremely well reproduced from photographs which are in most cases unhackneyed and well worth reproduction. A few of them, though excellent in themselves, seem to have only a very slender connection with the author whose text they illustrate.

Some teachers will regret the presence of the vocabularies, holding that pupils who have sufficient knowledge of Greek or Latin to read works such as these ought to be forming the habit of using a dictionary intelligently. But the

vocabularies appear to be correct and complete, and mark the quantity of long vowels in Latin.

Lack of space forbids a detailed examination of the introduction and notes of each work, but it may be said in general that in their commentaries all the editors succeed in keeping in mind what a pupil needs. Too many of the older school editions have commentaries loaded with erudition which the practised eye of the schoolboy ignores with discouraging completeness. Illustrative passages from other authors, if more than a few words long, are rarely looked at, and the editors of these volumes have wisely been very sparing of quotation. They do not shirk difficulties, however; rather they show a welcome readiness to leave something for the teacher to do by way of amplification after the lesson has been prepared by the pupil.

It is in the introductions that the editors have most scope for individual choice of method and material. Dr. Carrington is skilfully concise, Miss Pickstone and Mr. Snaith convey a good measure of information without becoming dull, but the highest praise must go to Mr. Paterson, whose seven pages on the historical background of the *Pro Marcello* and the *Pro Ligario* are masterly. Two other points may be noticed. Mr. Moore has written a most illuminating section on 'How to read Vergil' (which is embodied also in Miss Tilly's edition of Book IX)—advice which might be studied with profit by pupils more advanced than those who are likely to use this edition. And Mr. King in his notes and stage-directions for the *Hecuba* gives some really helpful guidance towards appreciating the play as drama. His observations are suggestive without being fussy.

W. W. EWBANK: *Second Year Latin*. Pp. x + 321; numerous drawings by T. H. Robinson, and photographs. London: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

B. A. VAN GRONINGEN: *Vrijheid en gebondenheid in den Griekischen literairen vorm* (Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 1, No. 11). Pp. 24.

L. W. P. LEWIS and E. H. GODDARD: *Foundations for Latin Prose Composition*. Eleventh edition. Pp. xiv + 200. Cloth, 3s. *Proses from 'Foundations for Latin Prose Composition'*. Limp cloth, 1s. London: Heinemann, 1938.

J. Mathewson MILNE: *Higher Certificate Latin Unseens*. Pp. 91. London: Harrap, 1938. Limp cloth, 1s. 3d.

MR. EWBANK's volume is intended to be used as a successor to his *First Year Latin*, but acquaintance with the earlier book is not necessary for a pupil who is to use this one. The two books together claim to cover all the essential grammar of Kennedy's *Shorter Latin Primer*, and to fit the pupil to tackle the easier Latin authors in his third year. The claim appears to be well justified, and Mr. Ewbank leads his flock along a path pleasantly diversified as regards subject-matter, adorned by some clear and interesting illustrations, and even provided with four Latin cross-word puzzles. The vocabulary is well chosen and wide.

Messrs. Lewis and Goddard's book is sterner stuff. The present is a reissue of a well-known work which is widely used. It has been corrected and revised, and a number of simplifications have been made in the preliminary exercises.

The one hundred passages in Mr. Milne's collection are drawn alternately from Latin prose and verse authors. In point of difficulty they seem to keep to the average standard of the Higher Certificate, and in length they are suitable for a school period of forty or forty-five minutes. Most of them come from authors whose style is tolerably familiar to pupils at this stage, but Velleius Paterculus and Claudian are a welcome addition to the usual fare. This book has one great recommendation in its cheapness, which has not been arrived at by using inferior paper or type.

D. S. COLMAN.

Shrewsbury School.

Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1938. Paper, f. 0.40.
VAN GRONINGEN describes briefly the classical Greek genres, which, though fairly numerous, long survived each with its own conventional

dialect and other stylistic marks. Their rapid development he attributes to the presence of great 'vital force' in the community; for the *genre* is (he holds) not the work of the individual but of society. In the classical period the individual poet achieved complete freedom and originality precisely because he consented to be bound by conventions imposed from without. Afterwards the illusion arose that originality might be attained by jettisoning the rules and confusing the 'kinds'. A reaction against this affectation led to the fixation of the *genres* and an excessive esteem for rules; whence also affectation and artificiality. But order is better than disorder, even, apparently, when disorder is temporary and experimental; and the moral drawn is that a really vital personality gains immeasurably by expressing itself in a well-established style adapted to the needs of a particular *genre*.

Crisply written and less trite than my summary implies, this essay suffers by ignoring both ancient and modern discussions of tradition *versus* invention in poetry. The author overestimates the contribution of the group; he fails, for example, to realize the debt of tragedy to the genius of Aeschylus. He also fails to distinguish between the laws which represent the internal living grammar or logic of an art-form held in the poet's mind, and the rules or conventions which are imposed 'from outside' by his materials, or by the need to please his patrons, or by the desire to serve the culture of his society. It is true that art often gains by its struggle with such material conditions. But when those inner laws also become externally imposed rules, decadence is bound to result. The explanation of decadence as simply the loss of vitality seems too simple. The rules become senile; technique becomes exhausted; words themselves lose meaning and expressiveness. Burdened by such 'servitude' even genius is paralysed.

J. TATE.
University of St. Andrews.

Galen *de causis procatarteticis* libellus a Nicolao Regino in sermonem latinum translatus. Ad codicum fidem recensuit in graecum sermonem retro vertit K. BARDONG. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum: Supplementum II.) Pp. xxxiv + 64. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 4.65.

THIS painstaking edition follows, though at a long interval, Kalbfleisch's (1904) of the *de causis contentivis* (sive *continentibus*), and is closely modelled upon it. The text of the Latin translation is, for the first time since the *editio princeps*, carried back to the two mss. An editor can be counted lucky who has but two mss. to deal with, and perhaps to make up for this, Bardong, following a suggestion made thirty-five years ago by Kalbfleisch (*op. cit.* p. 2) and the example set by Deichgräber with the *subfiguratio empirica*, has given himself the exercise of retranslating the whole treatise into Greek, which, as he claims, actually assists the interpretation of the Latin. Apart from this, therefore, the work offers a limited scope for textual activity, and the dissertational part of the book assumes a greater importance. Bar-

dong examines first the date of composition, which he plausibly places between 169 and 175. He follows this by a useful discussion of Galen's views upon causes generally, which is illustrated by copious quotations from other parts of his works and from elsewhere. This serves as an introduction to an analysis of the treatise as a whole, fully documented, in which the nature of the controversies involved is clearly brought out—against the 'sophists', and against Erasistratus and Herophilus—together with the principles upon which Galen bases his position: first and foremost, the data of observation and experience, and secondly, a sufficient training in the art of dialectical argument, both of which Gorgias, to whom the treatise is addressed, will find essential for combating the theories of his opponents. A considerable number of quotations from Galen and other authors is provided by way of elucidation at the foot of the text, but for some reason we hear nothing about Nicolaus and the earlier history of the treatise.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

E. S. BARLOW: *The Trachiniae* of Sophocles translated into English Verse. Pp. 47. Manchester: University Press, 1938. Paper, 1s.

LADY BARLOW has evidently made it her chief aim to produce lines which would read naturally, and on the whole she has succeeded. This aim involves some simplification, and here and there some loss of poetry, but the longer speeches as a rule are not only vigorous and natural, but sufficiently dignified. For the stichomuthia she has used, no doubt intentionally, a much more colloquial diction, and here she slips sometimes into the commonplace, or into the incongruously poetic. The lyrics, on the other hand, in a simple but frankly poetic diction, are admirable. They run well and often read like original verse. The translation as a rule is faithful, but there are one or two odd slips, notably 'Peleus' sons' for *παιῖδες* in l. 172. Misprints are numerous and sometimes serious: e.g. 'his' omitted on p. 10, l. 3, before 'sake'; 'be' is given for 'he' on p. 17, l. 7; a superfluous 'to' after 'know' on p. 21.

A brief Introduction by Professor T. B. L. Webster is useful and interesting. In it he discusses the debated point whether Deianeira is sincere in her speech to Lichas on learning the true position of Iole. He decides that she is, but the point is perhaps less vital than he suggests, for if she is not sincere, it would only mean that Sophocles thought that a great lady would hardly expose her feelings on such a subject to a man, and an inferior. Her confidences to the Chorus are explained by their sex and by tragic convention.

F. R. EARP.

Annetta MEAKIN: *Nausikaa*. A Love Story from Homer done into English Verse. Pp. 15. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Paper, 2s.

THE right way to judge this translation is to read it straight through without thinking of the Greek. So treated, it holds the interest better than most, for it tells the story naturally, and

at its best vividly. This probably was why A. E. Housman, as we are told in the preface, said that the translator had 'caught something of Homer'. The diction is simple, but, except for an unlucky phrase here and there, escapes the commonplace and the stilted. The metre, English hexameters, is treated with freedom, and some lines are hard to scan on any principle, accentual or quantitative, and the proper names especially suffer violence, e.g. 'At the home of my father, the mighty warrior, Alkinoos'. But most of the lines run easily and with no sacrifice of sense or order to metre—an unusual merit. The translation as a rule is free, but faithful in spirit, though here and there the tenses seem to have gone wrong and disturb the sense, as in the simile on p. 8.

F. R. EARP.

Edoardo ZELLER: *La Filosofia dei Greci nel suo Sviluppo storico*. Parte I: I Presocratici. Traduzione a cura di R. MONDOLFO. Vol. II: Ionici e Pitagorici. Pp. 719. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1938. Paper, L. 56.

PROFESSOR MONDOLFO continues with this large volume his notable translation and edition of Zeller's *Presocratics*, the first part of which appeared in 1932. (See C.R. XLVII. 148.) The Italian version (based on Zeller's fifth edition) is again faithful and clear; and it is again supplemented by a mass of extremely valuable information and comment from the translator's own hand. An introductory essay deals with the general scope and development of pre-Socratic studies from Zeller's time to the present day, with reference especially to the Ionians and Pythagoreans, and with full recognition of the interaction in recent times between the purely scientific and the 'mystical' line of interpretation. On each of the Ionians Zeller's text is enriched by an account of later work. The 'note' on Anaximander is particularly valuable; and special topics, such as the life of Thales or the Hippocratican *Περί ἰσθμοῦ*, are thoroughly investigated.

The greater portion of the present volume is occupied by the Pythagoreans. The editor goes fully into the question of sources, indirect and direct. Both the number-theory and the ethical doctrine are exhaustively studied; there is a very interesting essay on the topic of transmigration. While Professor Mondolfo is throughout notably impartial in dealing with opposing views, he makes it clear in this connection that he attaches high importance to the religious and mystical elements in the Pythagorean system.

The bibliographical lists, usefully classified and very full, are again a most valuable feature of the work. While the main lists come down to 1934, the editor has with characteristic thoroughness appended notes on relevant work published as recently as 1937.

This is altogether an admirable book and of first importance for students of pre-Socratic thought.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

H. RÆDER: *Platons Epinomis*. Pp. 64. (Det Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selsk., Hist.-fil Medd., XXVI, 1.) Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1938. Paper, Kr. 2.75.

MR. RÆDER'S essay is a welcome review of the present position of the question of the authenticity of the *Epinomis*. Naturally the author remains, as he has always been, on the side of the champions of Platonic authorship. As my own sympathies are also on that side, I may be a partial judge, but to my own mind at any rate the pamphlet seems an excellent exposure of the singular weakness of the case for denying the *Epinomis* to Plato and the still greater weakness of the reasons for ascribing it to Philippos of Opus. I would particularly commend the lucidity of the analysis given of the argument of the little 'dialogue' as a whole, for the purpose of finally proving, what ought in any case to be manifest, that the thought of the *Epinomis* is in every respect absolutely Platonic. As Mr. Ræder says, what probably annoys many modern *Platonforscher* is the incidental 'demonology' of the work. But this, when we remember that it is avowedly given not as pure truth, but as 'the likely' story, is myth, not science, and it is mythology on the very lines of the discourse of Diotima in the *Symposium*. I am particularly glad to read Mr. Ræder's timely protest against the widely current but quite arbitrary assumption that Xenocrates and the old Academy generally were unfaithful to Platonic teaching. How far this is from being the truth may be learned also from one important work to which Mr. Ræder makes no reference, Bignone's recent volume on *Aristotele Perduto*.

I am glad to take this opportunity to acknowledge the oversight rightly censured in myself and others (p. 56) about the precise meaning of 'similar' and 'dissimilar' numbers at *Epin.* 990d 2 ff.

A. E. TAYLOR.

University of Edinburgh.

C. ARPE: *Das τι ην εἶναι bei Aristotele*. Pp. 58. Hamburg: Friedrichsen, de Gruyter and Co., 1938. Paper. RM. 3.

IN his scholarly monograph Herr Arpe distinguishes three principal uses of *τι ην εἶναι* in Aristotle: (i) The logical use—the *τι* of a thing is equivalent to its definition. About this use, he thinks, there is no difficulty, since no question is raised about the actual existence of the *τι*. (ii) The teleological use. Here the *τι* of a thing is the end which the thing seeks to attain. A teleological view of nature, Herr Arpe suggests, Aristotle takes more or less for granted, but, even if it be granted, still the identification of ends in nature with the content of definitions requires more justification than Aristotle attempts to supply. (iii) The ontological use in the *Metaphysics*. The difference between this and the teleological use in the *Physics* is that questions are now raised about what the *τι* itself really is: when the answer is given (1051 b 31 and 1045 b 1), it is only that the *τι* is something self-evident, an *αρχή*, and to ask for any demonstration of its nature is a mark of *ἀναίδευσία*. The third section is the longest, and the author gives a careful analysis

of the relevant chapters of *Metaphysics Z*. That many of the difficulties which he finds there—especially difficulties about the nature of *οὐσία*—are beyond solution is common ground to most students of Aristotle; but a reader may wonder whether some of them are not created by Herr Arpe's rigid separation of the *Topics*, the *Physics*, and the *Metaphysics*. It is curious that he appears to treat Aristotle's logic as if it had no ontological basis. In a preliminary section, he considers the force of the imperfect *ἦν* and adopts the interpretation given by Natorp in *Platos Ideenlehre*. No consideration is given to the view that the imperfect expresses the explicit recognition of something which has always been implied. T. M. KNOX.

University of St. Andrews.

Plotin: *Ennéades*, VI. 2. Texte établi et traduit par E. BRÉHIER. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1933. Paper, 40 fr.

IN this final volume of M. Bréhier's Plotinus I have noted two emendations inserted in the text and fourteen suggested in the apparatus. At VI vi 18, 41 B. inserts *ei: kal el énavrtov ti ἦν*. . . . 'Ὁν δὲ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἂν τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐν, ἀλλ' <ei> ἔτερον, πρὸ αὐτοῦ κοινὸν καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐν. In his note he says 'lacunulam post *ἔτερον* conij.' The translation is: 'mais si cet être est lui-même [*sc. l'être*], il n'aurait pas à le produire [*sic*], et, s'il est autre, il y avait avant lui un terme commun à l'un et à l'autre, et ce terme serait l'être'. There is, however, no need whatsoever for emendation and B.'s translation suggests a complete failure to understand the Greek. Nor does the second emendation introduce any marked improvement in the text: at VI viii 13, 23 he reads *αὐτοῦ· ἡ <δὲ> οὐσία* for *αὐτοῦ ἡ οὐσία*. Of the suggested emendations most are unnecessary.

The translation is very faulty: for example, on p. 40 *ἡ ἐνδὸν ζῶη* = 'la vie, qui est chose intérieure' (my italics); on p. 69 *τὸ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὸν ἔχειν*, *τὸ δὲ διότι οὐκ ἐστὶν* = 'Nous admettons en effet qu'elle saisit la chose même . . .' (*δὲ* in a similar usage on p. 70 = 'manière d'être'); on p. 160 *καὶ τὸ ὡς ἐβούλετο ἀρα καὶ οὐκ ἐβούλετο καὶ τὸ τῇ βουλήσει ἐπόμενον, ὃ ἡ τοιαύτη βούλησις ἐγένετο* = 'Ce qu'il a voulu être, la manière, dont il l'a voulu en conséquence de sa volonté, tout cela est engendré par la volonté'!

At VI vi 18, 26 *ἄν* is omitted, but translated; at VI vii 2, 19 either <οὐκ> (Sleeman) or <μή> (Theiler) is translated, but nowhere mentioned; at VI vii 39, 5 f. a text which is merely suggested is translated. In the notes on p. 19, for *παρεγγλίνον* read *παρεγκλίνον* and mention which π.; p. 26, for 34 read 28; p. 68, supply source of emendation in l. 44; p. 98, read ||<25> post.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Dioscoride Latino: *Materia Medica*. Libro primo. A cura di H. MIHĂESCU. Pp. viii + 72. Jassy: A. A. Terek, 1938. Paper. AMONG the Latin translators of Dioscorides was a certain 'antiquus auctor ignotus et barbarus' (as Haller calls him), whose version

survives in two MSS., a Parisinus and a Monacensis, both of the 9th century if not earlier. Wellmann made good use of the latter, calling it D1; Dr Mihăescu refers it to the 8th century and calls it M. Books II-IV have already been extracted from it by Hermann Stadler; Book I had remained unpublished until our author, a Rumanian scholar, writing in Italian, now repairs the deficiency.

This Latin version is of no importance for the text of Dioscorides; as Dr Mihăescu says, 'il rappresenta solo un interesse linguistico, e niente altro'. It is an interesting and curious specimen of 'la tarda latinità', and all the better because we have the original Greek at hand to help interpret it. When it tells how to cure a cold by smoking the Indian *calamus aromaticus*, 'quod fumo per infundiblu ad hos colligitur', one is none the worse of a little help and guidance from *τοῦ καπνοῦ διὰ σύριγγος ἐλκομένου τῷ στόματι*. When we read of the *acoru* or *ahcoru*, which 'melior est albus et duru, sed non veteri sed fortis', the passage remains obscure, even with the help of *ἀσπυρίων* *τε καὶ πλῆρες εὐωδίας*. In the first line of all we read: *hyris* (i.e. *iris*) *illirica folia habet silpho similia*. The Greek has *ὁμοία ξιφίῳ*, which *ξιφίον* means *gladiolus*, or the Corn-flag. But our author (whose interest is purely linguistic) gives no interpretation, quotes no variant, and seems quite untroubled by the gross confusion between *silphion* and *xiphion*.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

A. BECKER-FREYSENG: *Die Vorgeschichte des philosophischen Terminus 'contingens'*. Die Bedeutungen von 'contingere' bei Boethius und ihr Verhältnis zu den Aristotelischen Möglichkeitsbegriffen. Pp. 79. (Quellen u. Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums u. des Mittelalters, Heft 7.) Heidelberg: F. Bilabel (Werderstrasse 32), 1938. Paper.

A CAREFUL study of the pre-history of an important term of mediaeval philosophy. The problem is this. *Contingere* = *συμβαίνειν*, and in mediaeval philosophy the *contingent* is contradistinguished from the actual as that which is possible, but yet may never actually occur. But in Greek *συμβαίνειν*, and in classical Latin *contingere*, are regularly used for that which does actually happen, though not invariably. How has the Latin word come to have this meaning of mere possibility which may never be actualized? The author's reply, given on a wide examination of the evidence, is that (1) the use has come to the Middle Ages from Boethius and to Boethius from the version of the *de Interpretatione* by Marius Victorinus; (2) ultimately it arises from an equation of *συμβαίνειν* with *ὑπάρχειν*; the use of *ὑπάρχειν* for the mere possibility which may never be actualized is confined in Aristotle to the chapters of the *Prior Analytics* which treat of 'modal' syllogisms; the intrusion of this sense of the word into the theory of *propositions* is due to the influence of the Greek commentators on Aristotle. A. E. TAYLOR.

University of Edinburgh.

Sister M. Agnes Cecile PRENDERGAST: *The Latinity of the De Vita Contemplativa of Julianus Pomerius*. Pp. xviii+185. J. H. GILLIS: *The Co-ordinating Particles in Saints Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine*. A Study in Latin Syntax and Style. Pp. xx+237. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2 each.

THE well-known series, Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, passes in Vol. LV from the known to the less known. The essay of Julianus Pomerius, which had considerable vogue in the Middle Ages, is unconnected with Philo's treatise of the same name. The present discussion follows the usual plan of the series. The bibliography knows only one work of Hoppe's on Tertullian and records out-of-date editions of Cicero's rhetorical works and of Quintilian. *Artifex* is surely a noun, not an adjective (p. 6); *typhus* (p. 77) occurs also in Ambrose; Benoist-Goelzer have examples of *inexplebiliter* (p. 80); *serminatio* (p. 93) should be *sermocinatio*. A certain number of misprints have been noticed. The work is, however, painstaking, interesting and useful. A certain amount of inexperience is shown by the list of 'works on vocabulary' (p. xiv). It is possible to admire the earlier volumes of this series without including in a list of nine works seven of these and only two others from all the rest of the world.

In Vol. LVI we have one of the most useful of the whole series. The use of 'co-ordinating' particles developed greatly after the classical period, but the immensity of the task has hitherto deterred students from the production of a (relatively) comprehensive and exact treatment. Dr. Gillis has made a sort of cross-section of the writings of four great Fathers in this particular, and has put together most valuable information on this important topic. Several works by these four authors have been minutely studied, in whole or in part, for the purpose. If it was worth while to use the *Lexicon Aetherianum* for purposes of comparison, the *Lexicon Commodianum* might also have been used. On p. 157, l. 6, *contra* is a mistake for *e contrario*; *nequiquam* (p. 176) is a bad spelling of *neququam*. A few misprints have been noted. A. SOUTER.

Oxford.

Études de Papyrologie, Tome IV. Pp. 233; 5 plates. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1938. Paper, P.T. 45.

THIS volume well maintains the standard set by its predecessors. Its contents are various. The first, A. Vogliano's *Autour du jardin d'Épicure*, is a reproduction from *Mélanges Bidez*, with some corrections. O. Guéraud follows with a very important article, *A propos des certificats de naissance du Musée du Caire*, reprinting two tablets re-edited from photographs by Sanders in P. Mich. III. To edit a defaced text from a photograph is always hazardous, and it is not surprising that there were points in Sanders's texts which called for, and here receive, correction by the help of the original. In the first these corrections are few, and some of S.'s proposals are confirmed; in the second, which

is in a very bad state of preservation, Guéraud's skill and patience have worked wonders, and a much improved text results. He follows the documents with a most valuable discussion of the subject of birth-registration in general.

N. Hohlwein's *Le blé d'Égypte* (pp. 33-120) is an admirable survey of the grain-supply, from the tenures and measurement of land to the commercial exploitation of the harvested grain. It contains nothing very novel but is a most lucid and handy summary.

A. Bataille, in two articles, *Nouveau fragment d'un ostrakon concernant Aménôthès fils de Hapou* and *Un nouveau dieu à Bacchias*, deals with Greek documents illustrating Egyptian religion; the second is followed by a note by Ch. Kuentz on the god concerned, Soknobrahis. H. Oellacher, in *Griechische literarische Papyri aus der Papyrussammlung Erzhzog Rainer in Wien*, publishes and deals at length with three texts from the Rainer collection, the second of which he assigns to Aristotle (he thinks two separate rolls from the same scriptorium and the same school library are represented), while the third he is inclined to regard as a work written by a member of the Academy about the beginning of our era. Finally, W. G. Waddell contributes two brief articles, *Poeta anonymus de avibus* (a small previously unpublished fragment) and *P. Fay. 204: The Aphorisms of Hippocrates* (a re-edition from the original of a fragment published by Calderini from a photograph).

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

G. A. GERHARD: *Griechische Papyri*. Urkunden und literarische Texte aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg. (Veröffentlichungen aus der badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen, Heft 6.) Pp. x+76; 3 collotype plates. Heidelberg: Winter, 1938. Paper, RM. 7.80.

THIS volume contains six documentary and seven literary papyri (nos. 168-180), with three plates which show that G. is a careful and skilled transcriber. The introductions and notes to the several texts are mostly succinct and relevant and evade none of the difficulties. Of the literary texts the small Alcaeus fragment has already been published; of the rest, the most interesting and difficult contains fragments of a lyric narrative poem written in a metre predominantly dactylic whose identity is obscured by the condition of the papyrus and the fact that the lines, as always in early lyric papyri, are written continuously. G. unhesitatingly assigns this to Timotheus on the strength of a reference to the story of Elpenor (the identification of the subjects of the other fragments, apart from allusions to the Nekyia, which was not as far as we know one of Timotheus' themes, rests on supplements about which G. is too positive); but the language is singularly unlike that of the *Persae*, and we do not know enough of this form of literature to say that Timotheus must have written it. In 180 G. prints some more fragments of the papyrus already known from Manchester and London (his republication of these earlier frag-

ments marks a distinct advance) of a play attributed to Philemon; but though the Heidelberg fragments are considerable, the whole still remains very scrappy. Both 176, a small mythological fragment which quotes some unidentified hexameters on the metamorphosis of some deity (does not *κύλ* in l. 11 suggest *Κυλλήνη* or *Κυλλήνιος* rather than *κύλλος*?), and 179, a piece of an early anthology apparently containing satiric epigrams, are worth notice. Of the documents, 170 deserves attention, an offer to lease *δημοσία γῆ* addressed not to the lessor but to representatives of the community, including the *πρεσβύτεροι γεωργῶν*. A plate of this would have been welcome; *κοί[νου]* might be possible in l. 10, and if *τοῖς* could be read for *ἐ[αυ τοῖς]* in l. 9 some difficulties would be removed.

C. H. ROBERTS.

St. John's College, Oxford.

Elizabeth VISSER: *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien*. Pp. 131. (Allard Pierson Stichting. Archaeologisch-historische Bijdragen, V.) Amsterdam: Noordhollandische Uitgevers Mij., 1938. Cloth.

THE theme of this dissertation is limited chronologically to the period indicated by its title (and that is wise), although geographically the net had to be cast a little more widely and evidence from Egypt outside Alexandria was considered. That extension is justified in view of the immense influence exercised by Alexandria, and necessary because of the paucity of finds on the site. The discussion is characterized by a refusal to make leaps in the dark.

The first chapter analyses the evidence under the names of individual gods and includes an excellent discussion of Agathos Daimon and some very good remarks on Sarapis. All students of the period must work through this chapter, as well as the source-material and list of Alexandrian civic names given in the third.¹ One impression may here be recorded. The measure of worship accorded by Alexandrians to deities of Egyptian origin indicates that the acceptance by Greeks of Oriental cults is far from generally presupposing racial mixture.

The second chapter studies the attitude of Hellenistic poets to religion. While I do not feel that Callim. fr. 9. 7 (Pfeiffer) proves him to be 'kein Adept der Mysterienreligionen' (it is simply a somewhat playful allusion to the Eleusinian mysteries), and miss a discussion of his treatment of Attis,² and should be glad to hear the writer's views on the epigrammatist Dioscorides in view of *A.P.* 6. 220, the discussion is judicious and helpful. Miss Visser has made a début in knowledge, and I

hope that she will give us much more work of this order.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

G. A. WAINWRIGHT: *The Sky-Religion in Egypt*. Pp. xvi + 121; 2 plates, 5 figures in text. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE principal thesis in this book, upon which everything else depends, is that the earliest recoverable form of worship in Egypt, earlier than those of Rê and Osiris and continually re-emerging until quite late times, was the cult of the sky as the source of rain. Of this cult the kings were the most important officiants, and their most noteworthy function was to be sacrificed (by fire) at the end of a stated period of office, apparently six years. The theory has much that is plausible and consistent with evidence from elsewhere, especially from various parts of Africa, such as has long been familiar from Frazer's *Golden Bough*. As set forth by Mr. Wainwright, however, it is supported by arguments of very uneven value (e.g., on p. 27, the Pyramid text cited to show that King Pepi contrived to escape such an end indicates rather that he never was in danger of it) and weakened by being blended with the more than doubtful hypotheses of Dr. Margaret Murray concerning the supposed fertility-cult of European witches. It is also quite unnecessary to invoke the alleged blindness which is apt to afflict rain-makers in order to explain tales of blind kings in a land where ophthalmia is endemic.

Still, if it is fundamentally true, it provides a good and consistent explanation for such strange tales as that of the virtuous Pharaoh Mykerinos (Herod. ii, 129, *sqq.*) with his reign of six years; the death in 'a chamber of (hot?) embers' of Queen Nitokris (*ibid.* 100, 7) and sundry others which the author cites and ingeniously relates to details of the supposed sky-ritual or of its god Set.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

John Frederick CHARLES: *Statutes of Limitations at Athens*. Pp. ii + 74. Private edition, distributed by University of Chicago Libraries, 1938. Paper.

THIS competent and lucid doctoral thesis deals with *προθεσμία*, the time allowed between cause of action arising and commencement of proceedings. The known periods are:—five years, in *δίκη ἀφορμῆς*, Dem. xxxvi. 26-7; in *δίκη ἐπιτροπῆς*, from the orphan's majority, Dem. xxxviii. 17; in recovery of inheritance, from the death of the wrongful receiver, Isae. iii. 58; one year, as to the proposer's personal liability, in *γραφὴ παρανόμων*: in *τὴν μὴ οὖσαν ἀντιλαχάνει, δύο months* after a jury's verdict, Pollux viii. 61, *ten days* after award by *δαιτητής*, Dem. xxi. 90; in *γραφὴ περὶ τῶν εὐδυνῶν, three days* after passing of final audit, according to most editions of *Ath. Pol.* 48, 4: *immediate steps* were required if a party, being present, wished to reject an arbitrator's award; similarly in *ψευδομαρτυρίας*,

¹ P. 32: Paneion has been explained by E. Harrison (*C.R.* XLIX. 172). P. 23, n. 5: we lack a title for the work by Peremans (and also the explanation of other abbreviations: *B.S.A.* here means *Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie*). P. 37: for Aion cf. Nock, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 27, 1934, 91 ff.

² On this cf. now O. Weinreich, *Mélanges Cumont*, 463 ff.

the benefit of *ἐπιταγή* surviving to the estate, Isae. v : no limitation existed in *γράφη παραδωμῶν*, as to rescission, Dem. xx. 144 ; in *ἀπογραφή*, Lys. xviii. 5 and 15 ; in homicide, Lys. xiii. 83, et al., Dem. xxiii. 80 notwithstanding.

The following inferences are made : the scope of Dem. xxvii. 26 includes any *δίκη* for private debt ; the four-day limit of Lex. Seguer. in *δίκη αἰκίας* is wrong, Dem. liv ; the year in *δίκη ἑγγύης*, Dem. xxxiii. 27, must run from default by the surety. For other actions the author, honestly indicating where evidence is wanting, offers *a priori* assumptions. As to the heiress he holds, after Ledl, that the *ἀρχιστράτης* could not revoke his allocation, after Wyse, that, notwithstanding Isae. iii. 6, a married daughter becoming heiress was not *ἐπίδικος*, and, after Caillemer, that on the birth of a legitimate son of a marriage duly following *ἐπίδικασία* an heiress ceased to be *ἐπίδικος*. He also discusses *usufructus*, and the facts of Dem. xix, xxxviii, xlix, lii, lvii, lix, Isae. v and x. Bibliography and index locorum.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Volume III. The Lockett Collection. Part i, Spain—Italy (Gold and Silver). 12 plates and 12 pages of description. London : Milford, 1938. Paper, 15s.

ALL concerned are to be warmly congratulated on the regularity with which one stately instalment of this important publication succeeds another. Not more than a year has elapsed since the issue of the fourth and last part of Volume II, all the parts of which were devoted to the magnificent Lloyd Collection of the coins of Italy and Sicily. Now we have the first part of Volume III, which is to contain the gold and silver of the Lockett Collection. The bronze, which is said to be exceedingly interesting, is reserved for a separate volume. Unlike their immediate predecessor, the geographical scope of which is strictly limited, these volumes will range over the whole Greek world. For, following in the footsteps of the famous collectors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, like William Hunter and Sir Edward Bunbury, Mr. Lockett has chosen to give free rein to the rare discrimination and taste with which he is so happily gifted. Yet it is easy to see that, despite the catholicity of his sympathies, he has been specially attracted by particular series : witness the seemingly endless procession of Tarentine 'Horsemen' on Plates III, IV and V, almost all of them in first-rate condition. And there is at least one great rarity—a stater of Chalcidian weight, which has sometimes been attributed to the Lucanian Sontini, known only from a casual reference in Pliny, but which was probably minted a good deal nearer the Straits of Messina.

As usual, Mr. E. S. G. Robinson proves himself a most competent editor. Every student will appreciate his endeavour to increase the amount of detailed information given in the text. The number of individual coins illustrated on the twelve plates—which are, by the way,

quite admirably executed—is not far short of 700. The figure will suffice to show that the spacing is less generous than has hitherto been customary. The advantages of this are obvious, nor can it be said that the general effect is unpleasing.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

Edinburgh.

Meriwether STUART : *The Portraiture of Claudius, Preliminary Studies*. Pp. xiv + 95. New York : Columbia University, 1938. Paper.

THIS is claimed to be an iconographical study of non-extant sculptural portraits. It is not a *lucus a non lucendo*, but a necessary preliminary to important historical researches ; it may, however, be noted as unlikely that Claudius' popularity could be gauged by the geographical distribution of his portraits (p. xiv), since Imperial propaganda was doubtless particularly assiduous in providing them to unenthusiastic populations.

A detailed study of this type is of great value to the half-fledged science of iconography. But even within the present narrow limits more use might have been made of coins and gems. Stuart's theory that the Veleia Claudius was an adapted Augustus (p. 45) is corroborated by similarly composite portraits on cameos in Berlin (Furtwängler, p. 349. 1210 pl. 68) and from the Marlborough collection (sale [1899] 407) ; and numismatic survivals of obsolete Imperial physiognomies occur at Aezanis (*BMC* 76 f., 87, 89 f.) and Phrygian Laodicea (Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies grecques*, p. 404. 118, cf. *BMC* 160 etc.). His refusal to consider exaggerated types as caricatures (pp. xii, 50) is likewise confirmed by grotesque coin-portraits at Sebaste (Rome) and Philomelium (Imhoof-Blumer, *Griechische Münzen*, 718a etc.). His list of reverse-types showing possible statues of Claudius could be augmented by Ilium (*BMC* 39) and Tabae (Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasiatische Münzen*, p. 517. 1) : a classification of obverses, which he does not attempt, might be even more fruitful. To occasions for portraiture should have been added *patrocinium-clientela*, whose private implications in this respect (cf. von Premerstein, *Abh. d. Bayer. Ak.* 1937, p. 88) were extended to the *principes* as universal patron and founder : this idea also provides an important motive for posthumous portraiture (omitted on p. 63).

Whoever was the most-saluted Emperor, it was not Constantine II (as p. 16, n. 112). The present writer hopes to show that the common belief that 'in the Greek-speaking world . . . the title *imperator* was regarded as the most significant of the imperial titulature' (p. 19, n. 124) is unfounded.

M. GRANT.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

W. NESTLE : *Der Friedensgedanke in der antiken Welt*. Pp. 79. (Philologia, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 1.) Leipzig : Dieterich, 1938. Paper, M. 7.25.

A DISCUSSION of such a topic could scarcely fail to be of interest today, and the material here presented is drawn from an extremely wide field. Beginning with Greek Epic, we

trace the idea of Peace and its implications not only among the chief religious, philosophic and political systems (Orphism, the Sophists, the Socratics, Stoicism) but also as revealed by the leading literary works of Greece and Rome. It is a far cry from Homer to Vopiscus, and 76 pages are no generous allowance for the task. Though the author has a neat touch with familiar material, some lack of depth is inevitable and many points deserve elaboration. Emphasis is laid upon the early appearance of the ideal of Peace, in contrast with the usual view that the ancients regarded war as the natural relationship between man and man: and from views such as that of Gorgias, that *Friede ist Gesundheit, Krieg Krankheit*, emerged the conception of a commonwealth of man. Rome's contribution to this was more apparent than real: imperial peace from Augustus to Pius was obtained at the expense of the political and cultural independence of peoples of the empire—*Völkerchaos*, not *Völkerfriede*—and war blazed anew thereafter. The survey expressly excludes Christianity, but the objection is made (p. 76) that 2,000 years of Christianity have failed to check war and even introduced *Religionskrieg*, a form unknown to the ancients. Not everyone will accept these rather bald statements, and some may feel slightly tendentious incongruity in the closing sentences when the author, for whom world-peace remains as much an unpractical ideal as for the ancients, disparages both pessimism and the optimism of pacifism and concludes in the spirit of Homer and Aeschylus *εἰς αἰῶνός ἀπαιτος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάσης*.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

A. DELATTE: *Herbarius*. Recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques. Pp. 176; 15 figures on 4 plates. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1938. Paper, 60 fr.

THIS edition, 'revue et augmentée', is some fifty pages longer than the first (see *C.R.*, LI. 146), and the pages are larger. The author has so added to his material that it is scarcely possible to open the book without finding a sentence or a paragraph, often several paragraphs, inserted, and corrections have been made here and there, although on p. 73 Popilius still has an extra *l* in his name and on p. 114, note 3, the author does not realize that the formula he names is the canticle *Benedicite, opera omnia* and not a grace before meat. The most important addition is an excursus (p. 4 sqq.) on the early history of herbalism in Greece, which is traced to Minoan Crete and found on several seals usually taken to represent the worship of a goddess or an orgiastic dance. These seals account for most of the illustrations, a new feature. A welcome addition is a subject-index, supplementing the *index locorum* which the book already had.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Walter MÜRI: *Der Arzt im Altertum*. Griechische und lateinische Quellenstücke mit der Uebertragung ins Deutsche. Pp. 215. Munich: Heimeran, 1938. Paper, RM. 4.50 (cloth, 5.50).

THIS little book consists of extracts, most of them fairly long, from 'Hippocrates' (one of whose works is consistently cited by the unusual title of 'epidemiurum') and Celsus, with a few specimens of Diocles, Antyllus and Aretaeus. Galen is not included, on the ground that 'Stil und Umfang seiner Schriften verboten es.' The omission is unfortunate; for Galen has the interest of being eminent both as a practising physician and as a man of letters, while Celsus, *mediocri vir ingenio*, as a contemporary called him, if he was a practitioner at all and not a mere compiler (the author's statement that 'nur die Ärzte selber sollen zu Worte kommen' seems over-confident so far as he is concerned), was not his equal in either respect. A few pages of explanatory notes are appended.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Richard Porson. A biographical essay by M. L. CLARKE. Pp. viii+133; 3 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 6s.

THE average classical student knows of Porson as an eighteenth-century Cambridge Grecian who loved good cheer, who discovered that the Greek tragedians obeyed a strict metrical law of which no Greek was ever conscious, who has all his emendations promoted to the text, and whose handwriting was the model of the Greek type still used by many presses. Some may have reflected further on the Professor who despised composition and yet has taught generations how to compose, who never taught and yet, more than any other man, laid down for English classical teaching that foundation of exact and finished verbal scholarship on which much else has been built, and may still be built so long as it remains sound.

Mr Clarke presents a consistent and sympathetic account of the achievements and failings of the Norfolk village lad who at ten was 'demanding the Moon's Age, Golden Number and Epact for Oct. 25th 1770' and died at 48 'second to Bentley among English scholars'. The background of Porson's career is skilfully sketched in—the relations of Literature and Learning in the eighteenth century, the unflinching private liberality which sent 'the unwinning cub' to Eton and Cambridge and afterwards endowed his researches, the state of scholarship in Cambridge, the activities of journalists, pamphleteers, and churchmen—and Porson stands out as a man of unique linguistic skill and critical power, distinguished among his contemporaries by integrity of soul, disdain of fame and money, and a passion for truth. 'It is recorded that he wept for joy on discovering that some of his emendations had been anticipated by Bentley.'

Mr Clarke prints in full Porson's critique of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*—surely the most perfect review ever written.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY,
LX. 1: JANUARY 1939.

G. M. Calhoun, *Homer's Gods—Myth and Märchen*: suggests that the 'dignified' treatment of gods reflects the poet's own generalized conceptions, whereas the 'grotesque' is derived directly from ancient folk-tales. B. E. Perry, *Some Addenda to Liddell and Scott*: collects a number of new words, forms, and meanings, chiefly from a unique ms. of the *Life of Aesop* (Pierpont Morgan Library MS. 397). W. W. Tarn, *Alexander, Cynics, and Stoics*: defends the author's view, that the conception of 'human brotherhood' actually originated with Alexander, against the criticisms of M. H. Fish (*A.J.P.* LVIII. 59-129) and adduces some new evidence in its support. C. W. Peppler, *Notes on the Text of Lysias*: examines a number of ms. readings and proposed emendations in the light of the author's previous study of durative and aoristic tenses. P. H. DeLacy, *The Epicurean Analysis of Language*: considers Epicurean theories of the language and style suitable for philosophy, and their application to extant writings. L. A. Post, *Notes on Plato's Laws*: offers (1) critical material based on the author's study of O (*The Vatican Plato and its Relations*), (2) discussions of the interpretations and translations of various modern editors. Deals with some eighty passages from 746d 3-5 to 969c 3. W. Kroll, ΣΗΤΑΝΙΟΣ *et* ΣΙΤΑΝΙΑΣ: holds that σιτάνιος means *triticum trimenstre* (coming to maturity in three months), and suggests that σιτανίας may be a mere corruption.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, XXXIV. 1:
JANUARY 1939.

H. W. Prescott, *Link Monologues in Roman Comedy*: analyses the use of monologues between scenes for keeping an actor on the stage and for providing opportunities for eavesdropping. R. Lattimore, *The Wise Adviser in Herodotus*: examines the use of the 'tragic warner' and the 'practical adviser' as a piece of technique. C. C. Mierow, *Tacitus the Biographer*: 'T. is fundamentally a biographer.' D. Grene, *The Interpretation of the Hippolytus*: the general theme is the assertion of the supremacy of Aphrodite, 'the primitive life-force', over Phaedra: H.'s rôle is secondary and his tragedy personal. W. Allen and P. H. DeLacy, *The Patrons of Philodemus*: argue from inconclusive evidence that P. was not exclusively attached to Piso. E. T. Salmon,

The Fourth Eclogue Once More: the child is Scribonia's; 'tuus Apollo' points to Octavian, who in the year of the poem had appeared at a *cena* dressed as Apollo. (No reference is made to R. W. Raper's note in *C.R.* XXII. 40, where a similar argument was put forward.) J. W. Thompson argues from the 'Tacitean ring' of a passage in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicon* that there was a ms. of Tac. at Trèves, where R. wrote, in the ninth century.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, LXV. 1:
JANUARY 1939.

J. E. Harry, *Médecine énigmatique*: commentary on Eur. *Med.* 214-24. R. Jumeau, *Remarques sur la structure de l'exposé livien*, argues that Livy did not always so remodel his sources as to attain a uniform style. In XXX 18-26 he distinguishes four styles: (a) dry, factual, unorganized, (b) plain but organized, (c) coloured and Livian, (d) coloured and un-Livian. The last he explains by free use of Claudius Quadrigarius, and hopes that stylistic observations may help to determine sources: e.g. the phrase *procellam equestrem excitare* only occurs in passages ascribed on other grounds to Claudius Quadrigarius. T. W. Allen, *Adversaria V*, defends Hesiod *Scut.* 288, Theognis 47, 659, and emends Theognis 1377 (κάκη ἤφι μόνον?), Aesch. *Septem* 415 (ἱρίν, Tyrwhitt), *Suppl.* 447 (πολλῇ γε), Agam. 525 (ἡχοῦ?), Herodotus V 28 (ἀνανέωσις), IV 29 (κολοβόν), IV 79 (διεπρίσθενσε?), Thuc. VI 74, 2 (θριγκούς), Marcellinus, *Vit. Thuc.* 51 (Θεμιστοκλείους πιδανά), Com. adesp. 1266 (μεστά). P. Horowitz, *Le principe de création des provinces procuratoriennes*. Why were some provinces governed by *praefecti* and others by *procuratores* (*praesides*)? In all spheres a *praefectus* is a military official; a *praefectus* represented the Emperor in provinces where ordinary civil government was thought permanently or temporarily inadvisable; if he sometimes called himself *procurator*, that only meant that he was in charge of the finances. Taking individual provinces H. argues that (a) Sardinia and Corsica were too near Italy to be left to senatorial governors, and, as *procuratores* were only used in frontier provinces, had to have *praefecti*; (b) the same applies to the Alpine provinces: their governors were *praefecti*, as they show by claiming (like those of early Rhaetia) the *tus gladii*, which a *procurator* would have regarded as self-evident. (To be continued.)

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Adler (E. N.)** etc. *The Adler Papyri*. The Greek texts edited by E. N. A., J. G. Tait, and F. M. Heichelheim; the Demotic texts by the late F. Ll. Griffith. Pp. viii+118; 16 plates. London: Milford, 1939. Paper, 42s.
- Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology**. Issued by the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology. Vol. XXV. Nos. 3-4. Pp. 67-146, plates XVIII-XXXVII. Liverpool: University Press, 1938. Paper, 12s.
- Aymard (A.)** *Les assemblées de la Confédération achaienne. Étude critique d'institutions et d'histoire*. Pp. xv+450. *Les premiers rapports de Rome et de la Confédération achaienne (198-189 avant J.-C.)*. Pp. xvi+438; 3 maps. (Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi, Fasc. XXI, XXII.) Bordeaux: Fréret (Paris: de Boccard, and Klincksieck), 1938. Paper, 90 fr. each.
- Barwick (K.)** *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*. Pp. v+222. (Philologus, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1938. Paper, M. 15.
- Bassett (S. E.)** *The Poetry of Homer*. Pp. 273. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 15.) Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1938. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Blake (W. E.)** *Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe translated from the Greek*. Pp. vii+125. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, \$2 or 9s.
- Blomgren (S.)** *Siliana. De Silii Italici Punicis quaestiones criticae et interpretatoriae*. Pp. vii+76. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1938: 7.) Uppsala: Lundequist (Leipzig: Harrassowitz). Paper, kr. 2.50.
- Βουρβίρης (K. I.)** *Κράτος καὶ πειθεῖα κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα*. Pp. 31. Athens ('Οδὸς Χέρσωος 15), 1939. Paper.
- Box (H.)** *Philonis Alexandri In Flaccum*. Edited with an introduction, translation, and commentary. Pp. lxii+129. London etc.: Oxford University Press, 1939. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Buttimer (C. H.)** *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon De Studio Legendi. A Critical Text*. Pp. lii+160. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. X.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Paper, \$2.
- Cambridge Ancient History**. Vol. XII.: *The imperial crisis and recovery, A.D. 193-324*. Pp. xxvii+849; maps, plans, and tables. Fifth volume of plates. Pp. xv+242. Cambridge: University Press, 1939. Cloth, 35s. and 15s.
- Catholic University of America Patristic Studies**, Vol. LIV. *The Syntax of the Simple Cases in St. Hilary of Poitiers*, by D. T. Gimborn. Pp. xviii+190. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1939. Paper, \$2.
- Chiera (E.)** *They Wrote on Clay. The Babylonian Tablets Speak To-day*. Pp. xv+235; illustrations. Cambridge: University Press 1939. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Cokoon (J. W.)** *Dio Chrysostom. With an English translation. In 5 volumes. Vol. II. Pp. vi+441. (Loeb Classical Library.)* London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Colonna (A.)** *Heliodori Aethiopica. A. C. recensuit*. Pp. lix+381. (Scriptores Graeci et Latini.) Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1938. Paper, L. 50 (bound, 80).
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum**. United States of America. The Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md. Fascicule 3. By D. M. Robinson. Pp. 62; 44 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth and boards, 22s. 6d.
- Day (A. A.)** *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*. Pp. 148. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- de Jonge (P.)** *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus XIV, 2. Hälfte (c. 7-11)*. Pp. 148. Groningen: Wolters, 1939. Stiff paper, f. 3.50.
- Denniston (J. D.)** *Euripides, Electra*, edited with introduction and commentary. Pp. xlv+226. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Dioniso**. *Bollettino dell' Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico*. Vol. VII—n. 1. Syracuse, 1939. L. 5.
- Ennis (M. G.)** *The Vocabulary of the Institutions of Cassiodorus*. Pp. xvi+171. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. IX.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Paper.
- Frankfort (H.)** *Cylinder Seals. A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. Pp. xlvii+328; 116 text-figures, 47 plates. London: Macmillan, 1939. Cloth, 42s.
- Friedländer (P.)** *Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza. Des Prokopios von Gaza "Εκφρασις Εικόνας*. Pp. 120; 12 plates. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1939. Paper.
- Giusti (A.)** (a) *Omero, Il libro III dell' Iliade, con commento e indici analitici*. Pp. 83. Lanciano: Carabba, 1938. Paper, L. 3.50. (b) *Omero, Iliade, Libro X, con introduzione e commento*. Pp. 90. Naples: Morano, 1938. Paper, L. 5.
- Guthrie (W. K. C.)** *Aristotle on the Heavens*. With an English translation. Pp. xxxvi+379. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

Hårleman (E.) De Claudio Mamerto gallicae latinitatis scriptorae quaestiones. Pp. ix + 103. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1938. Paper.

Hatch (W. H. P.) The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament. Pp. xiv + 33; 76 plates and letterpress. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1939. Cloth, 50s.

Hatzfeld (J.) Xénophon. Helléniques. Tome II (Livres IV-VII). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1939. Paper, 40 fr.

Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. VII: No. 4. Pp. 481-627; figures and plates. Vol. VIII: No. 1. Pp. 90; 27 figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1938, 1939. Paper.

Husselman (E.) A Fragment of Kalilah and Dimnah. From MS. 397 in The Pierpont Morgan Library. Pp. 35; 6 plates. (Studies and Documents edited by K. and S. Lake, X.) London: Christophers, 1938. Paper, 8s. 6d.

Jaeger (W.) Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. Translated from the Second German Edition by G. Highet. Pp. xxxi + 420. Oxford: Blackwell, 1939. Cloth, 15s.

Jernigan (C. C.) Incongruity in Aristophanes. Pp. 48. Duke University, Durham, N.C., 1939. Stiff paper.

Jonkers (E. J.) Invloed van het Christendom op de Romeinse wetgeving betreffende het concubinaat en de echtscheiding. Pp. 224. Wageningen: Veenman en Zonen, 1938. Paper, f. 4.90.

Kazarow (G. I.) Die Denkmäler des thrakischen Reitergottes in Bulgarien. Textband: pp. 190. Tafelband: pp. 6; 89 plates, 1 map. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II. No. 14.) Budapest: Institut für Münzkunde und Archäologie der P. Pázmány-Universität (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1938. Paper, P. 40 (bound, 43).

Kempler (H.) Die römische Geschichte bei Horaz. Pp. 138. Munich, 1938. Paper.

K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1937-1938. II: The fauna of the different settlements of Troy, preliminary report, by N. G. Gejvall; pp. 7. III: Zwei mykenische Hausaltäre in Berbati, von A. W. Persson und Å. Åkerström; pp. 5. IV: Die Herkunft der Runenschrift, von S. Agrell; pp. 53. V: Aus der Papyrussammlung der Universitätsbibliothek in Lund; kultische Texte herausgegeben von K. Hanell; pp. 24. Lund, 1938. Paper.

Kraeling (C. H.) Gerasa, City of the Decapolis. Pp. xvii + 616; 143 plates, 47 plans. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1938. Cloth.

Lake (K. and S.) Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. VIII. Manuscripts in Rome, Part II. Pp. 16; plates 526-601. IX. Manuscripts in Rome, Part III, in Messina, in Naples and in London. Plates 602-673, with letterpress. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences

(London: Christophers), 1939. Portfolio of cloth and boards, 42s. each vol.

Laureae Aquincenses memoriae Valentini Kuzsinsky dicatae, I. Pp. 341; 80 plates. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II. No. 10.) Budapest: Institut für Münzkunde und Archäologie der Péter Pázmány Universität (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1938. Paper, P. 40 (bound, 43).

McElwain (M. B.) Navis Aeria of B. Zamagna. Translation, with an introduction by M. H. Nicolson. Pp. viii + 123. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 12.) Northampton, Mass., 1939. Stiff paper, 75 cents.

Malcovati (H.) L. Annaei Flori quae exstant. H.M. recensuit. Pp. xxxii + 253. (Scriptores Graeci et Latini.) Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1938. Paper, L. 40 (bound, 60).

Marouseau (J.) L'Année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Publiée sous la direction de J. M. par J. Ernst. Tome XII. Bibliographie de l'année 1937 et complément des années antérieures. Pp. xxiv + 455. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 75 fr.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vol. XV. Pp. 124; 18 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1938. Paper.

Moore (J. A.) Sophocles and Aretê. Pp. xii + 78. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 6s.

Mugler (C.) L'évolution des constructions participiales complexes en grec et en latin. Pp. 172. L'évolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec. Pp. 132. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Fascicules 88, 89.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 35 and 25 fr.

Murray (A. T.) Demosthenes. Private Orations. With an English translation. In 4 volumes. II. Pp. viii + 419. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi . . . recensuerunt I. Wordsworth, H. I. White, H. F. D. Sparks, C. Ikenius. Partis II fasc. VI recensuit H. F. D. S. Pp. iv, 575-678. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Paper, 15s.

Oldfather (C. H.) Diodorus of Sicily. With an English translation. In 12 volumes. III. Books IV (continued) 59-VIII. Pp. v + 433; 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1939. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

Oldfather (W. A.), *Canter* (H. V.), *Abbott* (K. M.) Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum. Pp. 585. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1938. Cloth.

Olschka (K.) Interpretation der Agramer Mumienbinde. Pp. viii + 217. (Klio, Beiheft XL.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1939. Paper, M. 12.

Peeters (F.) Le culte de Jupiter en Espagne d'après les inscriptions. (Extrait de la Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, t. XVII.) Pp. 71. Brussels, 1938. Paper.

- Pendlebury* (J. D. S.) *The Archaeology of Crete. An Introduction.* Pp. xxix+400; 50 plates, 53 text illustrations, 24 maps. (Methuen's Handbooks of Archaeology.) London: Methuen, 1939. Cloth, 30s.
- Philippson* (P.) *Griechische Gottheiten in ihren Landschaften.* Pp. 83; plates. (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Supplet. IX.) Oslo: Brøgger, 1939. Paper.
- Piganiol* (A.) *Histoire de Rome.* Pp. li+576. ('Clio', Introduction aux Études historiques —3.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1939. Stiff paper, 75 fr.
- Pipping* (H.) *Studier i metrik och prosodi.* Pp. 31. (Studier i nordisk filologi, utgivna genom R. Pipping. XXVII. 2.) Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, 1937. Paper.
- Powell* (J. E.) *The History of Herodotus.* Pp. viii+96. (Cambridge Classical Studies, IV.) Cambridge: University Press, 1939. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Radermacher* (L.) *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen.* Pp. 360. Baden bei Wien, and Leipzig: Rohrer. Paper, RM. 9.50 (bound, 12).
- Radnóti* (A.) *Die römischen Bronzegefäße von Pannonien.* Pp. 220; 57 plates. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II. No. 6.) Budapest: Institut für Münzkunde u. Archäologie der P. Pázmány-Universität (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1938. Paper, P. 40 (bound, 43).
- Rapisarda* (E.) *Eschilo: Il Prometeo legato.* Con commento. Pp. xxxix+227. Turin etc.: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1936. Paper, L. 10.
- Rapisarda* (E.) *Teofilo di Antiochia.* Pp. cxxvi+157. Turin etc.: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1937. Stiff paper, L. 16.
- Revue des Études Homériques.* Tome V. Monaco: 4 Chemin de la Turbie, 1935. Paper, 30 fr.
- Rizzo* (G. A.) *Demostene, La seconda Olinthica, con introduzione e commento.* Pp. xiv+95. (Biblioteca di Classici greci commentati per le Scuole.) Leghorn: Giusti. Paper, L. 7.60.
- Rouse* (W. H. D.) *Homer.* Pp. 168; 12 plates. London etc.: Nelson, 1939. Cloth, 2s.
- Salanitro* (N.) *Nugae Criticae.* Pp. 21. Naples: Loffredo, 1939. Paper, L. 5.
- Schlesinger* (K.) *The Greek Aulos. A study of its mechanism and of its relation to the modal system of ancient Greek music, followed by a survey of the Greek Harmoniai in survival or rebirth in Folk-Music.* With an Introduction by J. F. Mountford. Pp. 1+577; 18 plates, 15 tables. London: Methuen, 1939. Cloth, 42s.
- Schnabel* (P.) *Text und Karten des Ptolemäus.* Pp. viii+128; 8 plates. (Quellen u. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Geographie u. Völkerkunde, Band 2.) Leipzig: Koehler, 1938. Cloth, RM. 10 (unbound, 8).
- Schwyzler* (E.) *Griechische Grammatik.* 2. Lieferung: Wortbildung und Flexion. Pp. xlvii, 415-842. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, II. 1. 2.) Munich: Beck, 1939. Paper, (export price) RM. 18.75.
- Severyns* (A.) *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, 1^{re} Partie: Le codex 239 de Photius.* Tome I: Étude paléographique et critique. Pp. xvi+404; 3 plates. Tome II: Texte, traduction, commentaire. Pp. 298. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège—Fasc. LXXXVII, LXXXIX.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1938. Paper, (together) 200 fr.
- Shotwell* (J. T.) *The History of History.* Vol. I: Revised Edition of An Introduction to the History of History. Pp. xiii+407; 4 plates. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 18s. 6d.
- Simetierre* (R.) *La Théorie Socratique de la Vertu-Science selon les 'Mémoires' de Xénophon.* Pp. 79. (Textes et Études d'Histoire de la Philosophie, Tome I, Fasc. 1.) Paris: Téqui, 1938. Stiff paper, 15 fr.
- Steiner* (A.) *Vincent of Beauvais: De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium.* Edited by A. S. Pp. xxxii+236. (The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication No. 32.) Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1938. Cloth, \$3.50 post-free.
- Stocks* (J. L.) *Reason and Intuition, and other essays.* Edited with an introduction by D. M. Emmet. Pp. xxii+259. London etc.: Oxford University Press, 1939. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Tebtunis Papyri.* Vol. III, Part II. Edited by A. S. Hunt, J. G. Smyly and C. C. Edgar. Pp. xxxiii+345; 4 plates. (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, Vol. IV.) London: Cambridge University Press, 1938. Cloth and boards, 22s. 6d.
- Tidner* (E.) *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didascalia Apostolorum.* Pp. xvi+288. (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar. Del 45: 1.) Stockholm: Wahlström och Widstrand, 1938. Paper, kr. 8.
- Trevelyan* (R. C.) *The Antigone of Sophocles.* The Greek Text as arranged for performance at Cambridge, March 1939, with an English Verse Translation by R. C. T. Pp. viii+87. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1939. Paper, 3s.
- Treves* (P.) *Démosthène: La troisième Philippique. Avec introduction et commentaire.* Pp. 138. Liège: Dessain, 1938. Paper.
- Valmin* (M. N.) *The Swedish Messina Expedition.* Pp. xvi+484; 100 illustrations in text, 37 plates, 7 plans. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, XXVI.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth and board, 84s.
- Walde* (A.) *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* 3., neubearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. Erster Band, A-L. Pp. xxxiv+872. Heidelberg: Winter, 1938. Paper.
- Westermann* (J. F.) *Archaische en archaische Woordkunst.* Suivi d'un abrégé en français. Pp. 199+ix. Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1939. Paper.
- Zeise* (H.) *Der Staatsmann. Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des platonischen Politikos.* Pp. viii+113. (Philologus, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1938. Paper, M. 7.